NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW
No. DCXXXII.

JULY, 1908.

THE LETTERS OF QUEEN VICTORIA.*

BY THE RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE, BRITISH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES.

FEW books had been awaited with more curiosity than that which was to contain a selection from the letters of Queen Victoria. Her character and career had become a cherished possession, not only of her own country, nor indeed only of her own subjects, but in a certain sense of the whole English-speaking world. She had lived in such close seclusion ever since Prince Albert's death that she was personally and directly known to very few people, probably a less familiar figure to the younger generation of her contemporaries than any one among her predecessors since the time of George the Second. But every one recognized the simplicity, the firmness, the straightforwardness of her nature. The warmth of her domestic affections had won the regard of the people. The correctness of her constitutional attitude in fulfilling the functions of the Crown had secured the respect of the educated class. Nevertheless, the forty years of widowhood had withdrawn her so much from observation that the revelation of her character and of her action during the earlier part of her reign has come as a sort of surprise to the

* "The Letters of Queen Victoria." Edited by Arthur Christopher Benson and Viscount Esher, G.C.V.O., K.C.B. 3 vols. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Copyright, 1908, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vast majority of people in England. It will be no less a surprise to readers in the United States. Nowhere was she more honored than here. The American people knew that she had always entertained a friendly feeling for them; and they had the deepest respect for the example which she set of a dignified and consistent life, adorned by the highest qualities of wife and mother.

The interest of the book is fourfold. It throws much fresh light on the international politics of Europe, and particularly on the relations of England with France, Germany and Russia. It illustrates the working of the constitutional machinery of British Government, and especially that part of the machinery which is least seen and understood by the world, viz., the position in which the Sovereign stands to the Cabinet. It supplements the biographies of not a few famous men who held high office between 1837 and 1861, by giving us letters of theirs hitherto unpublished, and records of their interviews with the Queen and with one another at various critical moments. And it brings out the personal character of the Queen herself, a character some sides of which had been little understood, and could hardly have been duly appreciated, save by those who know the influences that had affected her early years. A few words may be said on each of the above four aspects of the book.

In free self-governing countries, the historian has seldom any means of knowing how international questions look when seen from the detached and exceptional position of a throne. The occupant of the throne does not publicly express his or her own views, and is deemed by a sort of constitutional fiction hardly to have any personal views. Yet a sovereign is in more than one way specially concerned with international politics. He or she is technically the friend, practically always at least the acquaintance, sometimes the relative, of the occupants of other thrones; and is thus, while interested in them personally, interested in them also simply as sovereigns, because the good or evil fortune of any one throne reacts upon the throne as a political institution in other countries. Thus it is quite likely to happen that the sympathies of a sovereign may run in a different channel from those of his own nation. He may be better fitted than the people are to judge the personal qualities of another monarch, and worse fitted to judge of the policy which that monarch follows. Queen Victoria's personal sentiments towards

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the heads of other states do her great credit. She was kindly. She was fair. She was discriminating. Her strong liking for Louis Philippe disappeared, as was right and proper, under the impression of his bad behavior in the matter of the Spanish marriages in 1845-6, and revived only out of compassion for his misfortunes as an exile after the Revolution which drove him from France in 1848. When Louis Napoleon rose to power, she showed a more discreet reserve in forming her views of him than some of her Ministers did. Their later relations were sometimes politically close, sometimes almost unfriendly. But, though she never trusted him, and was in that well advised, for he was a strange shifty creature, she saw what good points he had and was perhaps fairer in her view than most of those who were in those days young and ardent Liberals and looked on "the Tyrant of France" as a sort of limb of Satan.

Among all the rulers of that time, the most striking and certainly the most formidable figure was the Tsar Nicholas. He visited the British Court in 1844, and the Queen's description of him, in a familiar letter (of June 11th, 1844) to her uncle Leopold, then King of the Belgians, gives one a better idea of the man and the way he was regarded than one might find in the pages of grave historians. There appears in it something startling to the reader of to-day; and the more startling because the Queen was a person who might have been expected not to feel it, viz., the sort of mysterious awe that then surrounded Russia and her autocrat ruler. Western Europe had not recovered from the impression produced by the disaster of Napoleon in 1812, when Russia appeared tremendous, impenetrable, invincible. The concentration of vast irresponsible power in the person of this one Tsar, reigning over many millions of men from the Baltic all across the vast spaces of Northern Asia into North America, made him seem a superhuman kind of being. However, the Queen liked him; nor did even the outbreak of the Crimean War produce any personal animosity. It was otherwise with the Queen's subjects. To most of them, especially after the harsh suppression of the risings of Polish patriots and the crushing by a Russian host of the Hungarians who were at war with Austria in 1848-9, the Tsar became the familiar conventional embodiment of tyranny and cruelty. This popular view of him had a great deal to do with the Crimean

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War. What one reads in these letters bears out what may be gathered from much else spoken and written in 1852-3—that that war was undertaken with very little knowledge of the real facts of Southeastern Europe and Northwestern Asia and very little consideration of what a war against Russia in defence of the Turks would be likely to effect. Public opinion felt, as the Queen felt, that the Tsar had behaved in a somewhat overbearing way when his controversy with the Turks began. It leaped to the conclusion that the Tsar's ambition must be resisted, and as resistance to him meant armed defence of the Sultan, war followed. In the whole business, no one seems to have thought so justly and advised so prudently as the Queen herself. Some of the credit for this was, doubtless, due to Prince Albert; but it is impossible to separate how much each of the two consorts contributed to the wise moderation and foresight which the Queen's letters and the Prince's memoranda evince. One rises from their perusal with a feeling that, if the views of the Sovereign and the Prime Minister had prevailed, war would have been avoided; and that its outbreak was due chiefly to two causes: the compromises made to maintain the apparent unity of a divided Cabinet, and the attitude of that grim old lion, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, then British Ambassador at Constantinople, who, whatever he may have thought of the Turks—and he often treated them with scorn—hated Russia, and who was in a position which enabled him, almost disregarding his instructions, to affect decisively the course of events. A curious comment on the want of knowledge in England of the actual state of things in Turkey is furnished by a remarkable letter, straightforward, honest and sensible, which the late Duke of Cambridge wrote to the Queen on his arrival at Constantinople (Vol. III, p. 34). Nor is the case of the unlucky Crimean War the only instance in which the views of the Queen and Prince may be deemed to have been sounder than those held by most of their Ministers.

Prince Albert did not understand Italy, and few will now agree with the views he expressed on Italian affairs. He was, moreover, a member of a reigning house and did not like to see crowns knocked off heads, even off heads so unworthy as were those of some Italian potentates. But he did understand Germany, and what he said was mostly true and useful. However, the best evidence of the sound judgment of the consorts is to be found in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the last memorandum which the Prince ever wrote to convey their joint views. It was one which suggested to the British Cabinet the softening down of a despatch then being sent to Mr. Seward regarding the affair of the seizure by Captain Wilkes of Messrs. Slidell and Mason on the steam packet "Trent" in 1862. Every one has admitted the wisdom of that counsel, which came at a moment profoundly important for both nations. We may all, in both countries, be grateful for it.

Whoever remembers Walter Bagehot's famous description of the functions of a sovereign in a constitutional monarchy will wish that that admirable thinker could have survived to read these Letters, and see the illustrations which they afford of the views he expressed with so much ingenuity and penetration. No equally full record of the way in which a mechanism of government so delicately balanced, and therefore so liable to get out of order as the British is, has ever been laid before the world. The topic, however, needs so much explanation, not only to American, but even to English, readers, for comparatively few people know how business is done between the Crown and its Ministers, that I must not attempt to enter upon it. Let it suffice to say that the high sense of duty which the Queen brought to her functions is strikingly evident from the very beginning of her reign. In the first years, before the graver anxieties came, she was gay and bright, as a girl of seventeen ought to be. She was devotedly attached to her husband and to her children, and loved the quiet joys of home. But neither the attractions of social life nor the charm of domestic life ever made her neglect the functions which the Constitution assigned to her. That an absolute, or almost absolute, ruler of brilliant gifts, like Trajan or Constantine, like the Emperor Frederick the Second, or Henry the Fourth of France, or Frederick the Great of Prussia, should enjoy the work of ruling is only natural. No pleasure is comparable to the pleasure of being able to accomplish great designs by the exercise of intellectual force and unhampered volition. But a constitutional monarch whose will is limited in many ways and whose abilities may not be of the first order, needs an unusual sense of duty and habits of unusual diligence in order to induce constant application to work, much of which is monotonous and in which personal preferences must needs be often thwarted by other considerations. In the Queen's case, the sense of duty seems to have never been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absent. She understood her position under the Constitution perfectly, and she did not wish to travel beyond it.

King Leopold wrote to her a few months after her accession: "All trades must be learned, and nowadays the trade of a *constitutional sovereign, to do it well, is a very difficult one.*" (He, like his royal niece, was fond of italics.) He was right. The task was anything but easy. That she succeeded so well was due, not merely to her goodness, but to her uprightness. Her habit of saying plainly and directly what she thought and wished gained for her a measure of personal confidence which was quite different from the respect that attached to her office, and this confidence in her integrity smoothed her path.

A chief part of the interest of these Letters is the new light they shed on the character and conduct of the leading English statesmen of sixty years ago. Some one has said that no man is ever quite the same to any two other men. The relation of a statesman to a sovereign is unlike his relation to any one else, and thus it helps us know him better because we see him at a new angle. Lord Melbourne, Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston, Lord Derby, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone, with other lesser luminaries, figure here, and their letters add something to our knowledge of each of them. Melbourne was Prime Minister when the Queen came to the throne, and remained so for four years. He is less known to the English public than almost any other man who has filled so high a post. I recollect Mr. Gladstone's once saying that nothing was more needed than a really good life of Melbourne. In these letters he comes out extremely well, as a shrewd, genial, kindly person, having his faults, yet an English gentleman in the good old sense of the word. He was not great; he was not even brilliant. But he was firm, honorable and tactful, and he had a sense of humor (see Vol. I, p. 543). He knew how to drive his team, and while he distinctly belonged to the Whig or moderate section of the party then beginning to be called "Liberal," he did not offend the Radical section as some other less Whiggish persons did. Whether it was wise for him to continue to correspond with the Queen after his retirement from office has been doubted; but it is, at any rate, clear that he made no unfair use of this privilege to influence her against his successor.

That successor, Sir Robert Peel, appears to no less advantage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here. The Queen had entertained some little prejudice against him, a prejudice not wholly unnatural under the circumstances disclosed in this book. His reserve at first chilled her. But his straightforwardness, his sense of public duty, the impression of power he made and his respectful courtesy to herself, soon removed all distrust or aversion. Her grief for him was scarcely less deep than that felt at the death of the Duke of Wellington.

Somewhat less favorable is the impression which we receive here of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell. Palmerston, so popular and powerful, during most of his long career, with the nation, was not altogether trusted or liked by his colleagues or by other leaders who nominally belonged to the same side in politics, such as Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright.

As Lord Melbourne, Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen begin to quit the scene new figures appear, prominent among them those of the two men who were to fill the stage during most of the later part of the Victorian epoch. At this time, however, neither Mr. Disraeli nor Mr. Gladstone was yet Prime Minister, so neither came much into direct contact with the Sovereign. The letters which they respectively addressed to the Queen, or sometimes to Prince Albert, are highly characteristic. But Disraeli, when leading the House of Commons in 1859, wrote brief descriptions of debates in the House which have a good deal of his epigrammatic touch. One deserves quotation. It relates to a debate on the Straits of Malacca Settlements:

"The speech of Sir J. Elphinstone, master of the subject, and full of striking details, produced a great effect. His vindication of the convict population of Singapore, as the moral element of that strange society, might have been considered as the richest humor, had it not been for its unmistakable simplicity. His inquiry of the Governor's lady, who never hired any servant but a convict, whether she employed in her nursery 'Thieves or Murderers'—and the answer 'Always Murderers' was very effective" (Vol. III, p. 352).

But, illuminative as these letters are in their references to the men and events of the time, their chief interest lies in the picture they give of the Queen herself. The traits of a sovereign's character are never unimportant, because they must needs, even where the monarchy is a limited one, be a factor in the history of the country. Tastes and temper, judgment, volition, manners, all make a difference,—a difference to the feelings of the people, a difference to the conduct of business with Ministers, probably also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a difference to the heads of foreign states. Apart from this practical significance, there were special circumstances in Queen Victoria's case to enhance the curiosity which attached to her personality. She had become a symbol of the Unity of the British Empire, of the connection between the ancient Crown of Great Britain and the numerous new colonies and dependencies which shortly before and during her reign had begun to grow in wealth and importance. To their inhabitants, she was a permanent figure, while the statesmen of the far-off Mother Country came and went and were for the most part forgotten.

About the practical ability disclosed in the Queen's correspondence there can be no dispute. Some critics have attributed to the influence and collaboration of Prince Albert much of the judgment and knowledge of Europe, as well as much of the argumentative strength, which appear in the letters relating to foreign affairs. His share is plain enough. His own memoranda reveal his views; and these views are often apparent in the letters which she signed. The language used is sometimes such as would not naturally come from the pen of one so young and still so inexperienced as the Queen was during the first ten years of her reign. But there is quite enough in the letters written before her marriage and in some later ones also, especially those to King Leopold, letters in the composition of which the Prince would have no share, to indicate her own talents. It is not the literary quality of these letters that is noteworthy. Though they are simple, direct, correctly and often effectively expressed, they are not striking either in phrase or in ideas. What does impress one in them is a sort of practical good sense, which shows that the writer had formed the habit of thinking. She was able to take in the position she had to deal with, and see herself in relation to her surroundings. At a time when most girls of sixteen or seventeen are filled with fancies and carried away by impulses, she had already a clear vision and a steady head. Likings and dislikings, of course, moved her, as they do all of us. She expressed them to her intimates, and especially to "Uncle Leopold," with a pleasing freedom. But she did not suffer them to affect her action. Her conduct in the question of the Ladies of the Bedchamber exposed her to much criticism at the time, and she seems to have said in later years, "I was very young then, and perhaps I should act differently if it was all to be done again." She was only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twenty. Yet, even in that instance, her attitude was perfectly dignified and, under the circumstances, not unnatural.

Probably it was a fortunate thing that her earlier years, before she came to the throne at the age of seventeen, had been passed in seclusion, and with few of those interested attentions by which one fated to inherit a throne is usually beset. Her governess, Baroness Lehzen, was a woman of strong character, who had evidently taught her self-restraint as well as habits of application. Her girlhood was, as she wrote long afterwards, rather a melancholy one. There were few pleasures, few indulgences; an austere gravity brooded over the quiet household, which enjoyed a very modest pecuniary allowance. Social engagements did not distract her mind from the study of what were called in those days "*improving* books." She had *read a good deal*, and had cultivated her natural taste both for drawing and for music. What was more important, she had become accustomed to reflect on what she read, and to reflect for herself, forming her own judgment. The criticisms on books which, before her accession, she confides to "Uncle Leopold," and the questions she puts him, show how much more mature and independent her mind had become at sixteen than is that of most girls at twenty-one. One discovers already in her two qualities which she retained through life, and which struck those who knew her personally in her later years, all the more because they seemed at first sight to be hardly compatible qualities. One was a strong personal pride and sense of the dignity of her position. She was not haughty, much less arrogant. But she was penetrated through and through with a sense of what it meant to be head of the United Kingdom and the British Empire. Yet, although this feeling was added to her own high spirit,—she would have been deemed a high-spirited woman even in a private station,—it did not in her bear the fruit of vanity. She was not vain. She knew her own intellectual limitations; and never tried to make a figure in fields for which she was not fitted. If one were to make a comparison at all between persons whose surroundings were so different, one might, in comparing her with Queen Elizabeth, observe that she was quite free from two of Elizabeth's salient faults: personal vanity and faithlessness. Truthfulness and honor were the basis of her character, and as she was above deception herself, so she had a horror of deceit in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others. She thought that international policy ought to be straightforward; and sometimes remonstrated against courses of action which seemed open to reproach on that score.

Frank and open as nature had made her, she learnt, as every one in a delicate and responsible position needs to learn, that there are many things one would like to say which it is not wise to say; many emotions which are perfectly justifiable, but which it is necessary to restrain. She carried sincerity so far as sometimes to abstain from saying what it would have seemed to most people natural to say in a conventional fashion, merely because she personally did not feel, and did not intend to force herself to feel, the sentiment which, conventionally, it would have been expected she should express whether she felt it or not.

It has already been remarked that she did not allow her dislikes, or prejudices, to interfere with her strict discharge of constitutional duty. The feeling might remain, and any feeling that had once laid hold of her mind was not easily changed. But how little it prevented her from doing what was right in her official relations is shown by the case of Lord Palmerston. Between herself and him when Foreign Minister there had been a long controversy as to his practice of sending off despatches before letting her see them. Both parties stood to their guns, and the contention was at one time quite sharp. But when Palmerston afterwards became Prime Minister, he had always perfectly fair treatment from her. The later correspondence, so far as we have it here in print, betrays no traces of the old annoyance. And when Lord Aberdeen suggested, in September, 1853, that Lord Palmerston should be invited by the Queen to Balmoral to stay there with her as Minister in Attendance, she complied, though there could have been no guest whose presence she less desired. There was no pettiness in her nature, and plenty of that best sort of tact which comes from trying to understand the feelings of others, and from a genuine kindliness of heart. The long and intimate correspondence with King Leopold is, perhaps, the best illustration of her deferential modesty, on the one hand, and her independence, on the other. She often asked the old man's opinion, and gave weight to it. But she never blindly followed it; and when she differed from him and did not follow his advice, she expressed herself with a respectful courtesy which averted any possibility of vexation on his part.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the strength of her domestic affections it is unnecessary to dwell. They were known to every one, and no doubt they contributed to her popularity. But strong family affection does not always imply a general goodness and kindliness of nature, such as these letters disclose. The Queen had, what some cynical observers have, quite unjustly, denied to women, a capacity for friendship. It is not very easy for a sovereign, even in a constitutional country, to form a friendship with any one in the position of a subject. But the Duke of Wellington, Lord Melbourne and Sir Robert Peel became to her friends as well as Ministers, and, what is more, they evidently felt a real friendship for her, although the Duke of Wellington's age and grave habits and Sir R. Peel's extreme reserve, prevented them from expressing their feelings as easily and as prettily as Lord Melbourne did. Perhaps Lord Aberdeen might also be included in this inner circle, for she always writes to him with a confidence and sense of mutual understanding which do not appear in the letters to Palmerston or Lord John Russell or Lord Derby.

The correspondence here given closes with the death of Prince Albert in December, 1861. It was a turning-point in the Queen's life, for she never recovered the brightness of her earlier years, never again mixed freely in society, and, indeed, never, till almost the last years, came to London at all except for a night or two when there was some official function which required her presence. The letters of the forty years that followed the great sorrow till her own death in January, 1901, years which saw even greater changes both at home and abroad than the years from 1837 to 1861, have not yet been given to the world. They could not well be; for the wise boldness shown in publishing now so freely much which was at one time highly confidential, and which is all the more precious to the historian because it was confidential, renders it undesirable to make public at this moment what affects persons, whether living or already departed, who belong to the generation still on earth. Meantime, the historian will be grateful for what he has received, and all those who, in America as well as in England, respected the character and valued the fine example of Queen Victoria will rejoice to know how good a ground they had for their admiration.

JAMES BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DURHAM WHITE STEVENS.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY BARON KOGORO TAKAHIRA, IMPERIAL JAPANESE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES.

HISTORY is replete with instances of men who unselfishly have labored in behalf of the general welfare and peace of two nations, and, more particularly, of their native land and of a race which has come under its control. To few men, however, have been entrusted the stupendous work of serving three peoples at the same time: of patriotically advancing the interests of his own country, of aiding in the fashioning of the destinies of another and of assisting in the regeneration of a third. Durham White Stevens was one of these towering figures, and in his life the world has an example of high patriotism, of unusual service and loyalty and of broad humanitarianism, which is worthy of universal commendation and better still of future emulation.

I am able to write of Mr. Stevens in two characters—that of an official of my government and that of his friend. In both capacities, putting aside the natural feeling of grief and indignation which his assassination inspired, I am struck by the sheer wantonness of the crime. It had no justification from any act of his life. He never knowingly did any one an injury; on the other hand, it was his nature unselfishly to serve others. It was absolutely useless; for, in the scheme of life, one instrument, however imperfect, replaces another. It was without consequences or the possibility of them. Japan has set her hand to the plough in establishing stable conditions in Korea and cannot relinquish it until the work is finished. It was perpetrated by an obscure and insignificant Korean criminal, thus carrying out that inexplicable and to me mysterious Will which puts the life of the highest in the hands of the most lowly. Admitting that the crime was inspired by a perverted patriotism, it aroused the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keenest regret among the enlightened of the assassin's countrymen, for they felt the blot which thereby had been placed upon them, and realized how great was the horror caused the American nation at having its soil reddened with the blood of one of its blameless citizens. And, beyond this, they recognized that in the death of this man Korea had lost one of its truest and wisest friends.

It is hardly necessary for me to recite the facts connected with the murder of Mr. Stevens; but I think it important to remind the American people that assassination is the traditional practice of the Koreans, and they would continue to observe it if permitted to remain in the backward state in which they live. Their history is dotted with these black crimes. They are in that unfortunate condition of mediævalism, similar to that in other undeveloped lands, wherein the knife and poison and the modern bullet are directed, not merely against the agents of the government which is endeavoring to provide them with peace and order and to lead them to modern civilization, but against themselves. During the spring of 1907, four attempts were made to assassinate members of the Korean Ministry. Two of the Ministry now in power — the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture—are marked for death. "We must do our best," states a high-sounding manifesto of the leader of the so-called General Korean Righteous Army, "to kill all Japanese, their spies, allies and barbarous soldiers." The purpose thus proclaimed cannot possibly deter Japan from continuing what is her manifest duty, not only to herself, but to the Koreans and the world at large. It arouses, in thinking minds, not so much condemnation as pity for the ignorance it displays. For such crimes as it contemplates, especially when committed upon men of the high type Mr. Stevens represented, can only react upon those responsible for them and the cause, however purposeless, they advocate.

It is not my intention in this article to dwell upon the unwise and improvident policy of the Rulers of Korea, which produced internal conditions unsatisfactory and even intolerable for its own people, and out of which loomed the menace of danger to the peace of the Far East. This feature of the matter can be perhaps best disposed of by merely stating that, in some respects, Korea occupies the same relation to Japan that Cuba does to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States. The American people felt that they could not have a condition of disorder at their door, and went to war to stop it. They liberated Cuba, but were compelled by events to re-enter upon its government. Japan's course with respect to Korea is almost parallel. We went to war to maintain Korean independence and were obliged to fight another war, partly because of Korea. And now, in order to abate a nuisance that could only be fruitful of further strife, we are seeking to provide the people of that country with a stable government, under which they may enjoy tranquillity and the prosperity which follows in its train.

This policy has dominated everything Japan has done. It was the policy Mr. Stevens pursued during the time he served as Adviser to the Emperor of Korea. When he first arrived at Seoul and assumed his delicate duty, Mr. Stevens found himself an object of suspicion and every step he advised subjected to the most jealous scrutiny. Here his tact and judgment were shown and re-enforced by his honesty, and it was not long before he enjoyed the complete confidence and trust of the Emperor and his supporters, and he worked hand in hand with them to put into effect the reforms which the interests of the people absolutely required. Those in Seoul who know of his work applaud it, and this includes not merely Japanese but foreigners and Koreans; and some day, I predict, the Korean people, as a unit, will glorify him for it.

But his work in Korea, after all, was merely one feature of Mr. Stevens's career. Its beginning is graven upon American history. After his graduation from Oberlin College and from the Columbian Law School, in Washington, he was appointed Secretary of the American Legation in Tokyo. His appointment resulted from his contact with American public men in the course of his work as a journalist which he performed while studying law. In this profession Mr. Stevens displayed high ability, and he was known throughout the Capital as an energetic, accurate reporter, reliable and dependable. Unquestionably the work quickened his native judgment of men and events, and gave him that clearness of vision and style which is found in all the diplomatic notes he prepared. He came to Japan at the period of our transition; and, sympathizing with us in our effort to adopt modern methods of government and civilization, became the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trusted friend of our statesmen of that time. He studied the Japanese language and soon acquired it. He possessed a capacious mind, and he stored it with our customs and traditions, our literature and our history. So great was the impression he made upon the officials of my Government that in 1883, after a service of ten years in the American Legation, Mr. Stevens was induced to enter the employ of the Japanese Government.

I first met Mr. Stevens in Tokyo in 1877, but it was not until 1883 that I enjoyed those intimate relations with him which true friendship insures. Mr. Stevens's first assignment was to Washington. He came in the suite of the new Japanese Minister, Count Terashima, who had been Minister of Foreign Affairs. At that time Japan was preparing to establish a parliamentary system of government. Desiring to keep the authorities and his friends advised in regard to the methods obtaining in foreign lands, Count Terashima made a close study of the Government of England. He turned his notes over to Mr. Stevens, who used them as the basis of one of the most forceful essays I have ever read. I served as *chargé d'affaires* in Washington at that time, and the pleasantest memories I have relate to my association with Mr. Stevens.

It is unfortunate that I cannot describe in detail the remarkable services Mr. Stevens rendered, not only to my country, but to America and the whole world. I cannot do so for two reasons: first, because etiquette forbids diplomatic revelations; and, second, because I well know that Mr. Stevens, as modest a man as ever lived, would not wish it. In an address which the late lamented John Hay made upon "American Diplomacy," he included the following observation:

> "There are two important lines of human endeavor in which men are forbidden ever to allude to their success—affairs of the heart and diplomatic affairs. In doing so, one not only commits a vulgarity which transcends all question of taste, but makes all future success impossible. For this reason, the diplomatic representatives of the Government must frequently suffer in silence the most outrageous imputations upon their patriotism, their intelligence and their common honesty. To justify themselves before the public, they would sometimes have to place in jeopardy the interests of the nation. They must constantly adopt for themselves the motto of the French Revolutionist, 'Let my name wither, rather than my country be injured.'"

So all I can do is to give the bare outlines of Mr. Stevens's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

career in the service of Japan. His first assignment, as I have said, brought him to Washington, where he acted as counsellor of the Legation. He remained in the American Capital but a short time, being recalled to Tokyo to perform special work in connection with the revision of treaties between Japan and foreign Powers. Having accomplished this duty, with credit to himself and to the interest of all the nations participating in the negotiations, Mr. Stevens was appointed member of a mission under instructions to adjust certain difficulties that had arisen in the relations of China, Korea and Japan. He returned to Washington in 1887 and remained there until 1893, when he was again recalled to Tokyo in connection with the question of the treaty revision. He was ordered back to Washington, where he resumed his duties as counsellor, but paid official visits to Japan in 1900 and 1901. He participated largely in the revision of treaties between the United States and Japan, and aided in the establishment of official relations between Japan and Mexico. He was the Japanese agent in Hawaii in 1900-1901, in connection with questions which had arisen in those islands. During the first three years of my service here as Minister, Mr. Stevens, as counsellor, rendered invaluable service; and, working together, our friendship throve. His appointment in Korea, soon after the war was begun, was in accordance with a protocol concluded by the Japanese and Korean Governments.

These are but the skeleton facts of a Giant's career, but those who have a knowledge of the events which have unrolled themselves in the Pacific and the Far East, indeed in the whole world, during the last quarter of a century, can obtain an idea of the mind which dealt in masterly fashion with them. What I love to think of, in connection with Mr. Stevens, however, is the intense desire he had that the relations of his own country and of the country he served should be so close, so firm, that nothing could ever arise to shake them. I do not reveal any diplomatic secret when I say that during the many years Mr. Stevens was associated with the Legation in Washington—and here I speak authoritatively, for I was in charge for a part of the time I refer to—he acted not merely as the counsellor of the Minister, but as an American, and he sought the solution of all questions which was in the interest of both countries. He realized that an advantage by one country over the other was merely a temporary gain,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that it was certain to be followed by vexatious discussion in the future which might have untoward consequences. Therefore what he sought always was an arrangement mutually satisfactory to all concerned; and he sought it without thought of its effect upon his personal fortunes, for he worked always behind the scenes.

Perhaps the best evidence of Mr. Stevens's loyalty to America and Japan is furnished by a letter he wrote while in Tokyo to a distinguished officer of the American Navy just before he started on his ill-fated trip to Washington. A copy of the letter has been handed to me, and I have been authorized to use it. It is as follows:

"TOKIO, *December 24, 1907.*

"MY DEAR ——:

"Your letter of November 19th, addressed to me at Seoul, followed me to Tokio, whither I have come on my way home. I shall probably leave some time before the middle of January, and therefore, if all goes well, it will not be long after the arrival of this letter before I shall have the pleasure of meeting you personally.

"You have already noticed, of course, that the departure of the fleet from Hampton Roads has been made the occasion of comment by a number of prominent officials and journalists in Japan. These expressions of opinion were elicited in response to requests from the United States, and are a true reflex of the views one hears expressed on all sides in this country.

"Apropos of Japanese opinion on this subject, you say that you observe that the Japanese press has been very quiet of late, and that you hope that the press of the United States will assume the same attitude, as only harm can be done by careless newspaper comments. A truer word was never spoken. But, in the interest of historical accuracy, it should be remembered that most of the silly talk which at first befogged this perfectly proper and natural development of American naval policy did not come from Japanese sources. The disquieting rumors which flew about in such abundance when the proposed movement of the fleet was first mooted were under American and European date-lines. They were repeated naturally in the Japanese press, as were also the indiscreet remarks of certain perfervid American patriots, and this resulted in something like the retort discourteous on the part of one or two sensational newspapers in Japan. The Japanese press as a whole, however,—the press which really represents intelligent public opinion,—was never anything else but quiet. I am inclined to emphasize this point somewhat, because, although it may seem now to possess only reminiscent interest, the impression seems to remain, and apparently you share it, that the announcement of the transfer of the fleet to the Pacific was greeted by a jingoistic outburst in Japan. Nothing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be more diametrically opposed to the facts. The surmises concerning hostile designs possibly implied by this action on the part of the American Government, as I have said before, came from other sources. They were repeated in Japan, but with incredulity and amazement. There was no reason why it should have been otherwise. The friendship of Japan for America,—and by this I mean the friendship of the great mass of the people,—is a traditional feeling, having its origin in the unique circumstances which first brought the two countries into contact with each other, and strengthened to an unusual degree by the unvaryingly considerate, and sometimes even altruistically friendly, attitude of the United States. It is a deeper and a more genuine feeling than that customarily expressed in the honeyed phrases of diplomatic intercourse. I do not think that this is thoroughly comprehended in America, even in circles usually well informed regarding our foreign relations. And I am quite certain that many of the rest of our countrymen, especially some of those in the Philippines, would be the better for an elementary course in Oriental history. There would then, perhaps, be less of a tendency on their part to 'imagine strange things.'

"The thing most to be apprehended is that, largely through this ignorance, we may sacrifice one of the most valuable assets which we possess in the East, the genuinely cordial friendship of Japan. Wholly unfounded apprehensions regarding her political aspirations may unconsciously, but none the less surely, lead us into an attitude which cannot fail to retard the development of the great interests we possess in the Orient, interests which need never clash with hers, and which will gain much by the continuance of the intimate relations at present subsisting between the two countries. This is especially true of possible action with reference to immigration. You say there can be no war unless possibly it come from irritation on the part of the Japanese regarding restriction of immigration, which some people seem to demand. You may rest assured that there will be no war on that account. But, supposing that the desire and the purpose of the persons to whom you allude is carried into effect without regard to the feelings or the wishes of Japan, it would be self-deception to expect that the Japanese people will continue to entertain for us the same cordial friendship and belief in our good-will which at present exist. War, as the President has well said, is unthinkable and would be a crime. There is no *arrière-pensée* on the part of Japan, as seems to be thought in some circles which should be better informed, that would ever make it possible under any circumstances save of aggression or attack, which are also unthinkable. There would be no open breach of friendly relations even, but American influence in Japan would lessen to the disappearing-point; and, while beyond doubt the outward amenities of international intercourse would still be scrupulously observed, we would cease to enjoy the advantages which our unique connection with the affairs of Japan has hitherto given us. And it goes without saying that some of our dear European friends would like nothing better than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secretly to do what they could to increase this misunderstanding. It seems to me that the events of the past few months have clearly shown a desire on the part of some of them to embroil the two countries.

"I have been speaking, of course, of the probable results of the passage of an exclusion bill by Congress. The immigration question, as any one at all familiar with the subject knows, presents a difficult problem. But a solution honorable to both parties can be found; and, as there is no good reason why both of them should not deal with the matter in a spirit of mutual accommodation and good-will, I am confident that such a solution will be reached. But, should Congress take the bit between its teeth and pass an exclusion bill, there is no amount of sugar which can sweeten that pill to the Japanese palate. There will, as before said, be no war, and the Philippines and Hawaiian Islands will be as safe from attack then as they have always been; but the warm regard for America which has hitherto been one of the salient features of Japan's international relations will be transformed into a wall of chilly reserve which, I fear, will last for many years to come.

"Pardon me, my dear ——, if I appear to be playing the part of a male Cassandra; but, believe me, it is not without good reason. I date back, you know, to the days of Bingham, and those were not so very far removed from the days of Perry and Townsend Harris; and I have seen the ties which these great men created strengthened by repeated proofs of unselfish friendship by the United States for this the most progressive and receptive among the nations of the East. Coincident with that I have witnessed the growth of the firm belief on the part of the people of Japan that the American Government and people are more than friends in the hackneyed and formal sense of diplomatic usage, but sincere friends upon whose fraternal sympathy and regard they could always rely in the settlement of the perplexing problems created by their natural and legitimate national aspirations. It seems to me, therefore, especially regrettable that the warmth of this feeling, so useful to us in the fulfilment of our own reasonable ambitions in the Orient—even if we regard it from a wholly selfish standpoint—should be cooled by action on our part. Above all does this seem a pity when such action is the result of apprehension of dangers largely illusory, but which, even at the worst, can be avoided by the exercise of forbearance and practical good sense.

"Knowing how deeply interested you are in these matters, I have not hesitated to speak without reserve: and at the same time have no objection to your making whatever use of this letter you may think worth while.

"With best wishes, and in the hope of seeing you soon,

"Yours faithfully,

"D. W. STEVENS."

Mr. Stevens was not the bloodless type of diplomat which the world knows in fiction. He was a warm-hearted, generous gentleman, who believed in mutual trustfulness, mutual help-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fulness and unswerving honesty. When he was confronted by the Korean who had shot him, he forgave him, because of the ignorance which had inspired the act, thus observing the illustrious example of that One who gave Christianity to the world. "You poor, ignorant man! I do not blame you for shooting me," he told the man, "because you do not understand." Nothing could have been more sublime, but it was in keeping with his entire life. There are few who know that he was the mainstay of his sisters; for his devotion to them was not a thing to be hawked about for the public to admire, but a natural duty which deep affection made light.

The Emperor of Japan honored Mr. Stevens in life by conferring upon him numerous high decorations, and in death with the Rising Sun of the first class, the highest honor a Japanese Government servant can expect from his Sovereign as a reward for any lengthy services, and a gift of $100,000, including a sum from the Korean Emperor, to his heirs. These rewards were the mere expression of the affection and gratitude of His Majesty and of the entire Japanese people for the magnificent work which Mr. Stevens performed in their interest. As a son of Japan it is a pleasure to me, as he cannot be recalled, to add my wreath of thankfulness to those which have been placed upon his tomb, and here to give testimony to what he accomplished for humanity.

K. TAKAHIRA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CENTENNIAL OF LINCOLN AND DARWIN.

BY WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

On February 12th, 1909, fall the centennials of Abraham Lincoln and of Charles Darwin. Already we hear that preparations are making in England and America to celebrate their birthdays. The British scientific bodies will doubtless do full honor to Darwin, the greatest of modern men of science, not only in Great Britain, but in the civilized world. In like manner our American historical societies, perhaps even Congress and some of our State and city governments, may be counted on to commemorate Abraham Lincoln. But is this enough? Does not destiny itself, which saw to it that the foremost Briton and the foremost American of the nineteenth century should come into life on the same day of the same year, seem to point out that Britain and the United States should unite in celebrating this centennial? In all history, there is no other similar coincidence.

The Twelfth of February, the birthday of Lincoln and Darwin, should be a day of international festival, a sort of Pan-Anglo-Saxon reunion, in which the scattered members of a great race should come together to reaffirm their racial principles, to feel the thrill of common hopes and common emotions, and to realize in the most convincing way that blood is thicker than water.

Public or national celebrations are never so fruitful as when they have for their object a person. The personifying instinct is one of the strongest in the hearts of men—so strong that, even when abstractions or principles are the theme, the orator and the poet, and the philosopher not less than they, clothe these abstractions with living garments of personality which even children can recognize. Now, it happens that Lincoln and Darwin embodied many of the most characteristic qualities of our race.

What have been the great English political ideals in govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, as they have been unfolded century by century, sometimes retarded, sometimes checked, but never abandoned? These have been the belief in representation and the belief in law. No King who ruled in England after the Conquest was so absolute that he could safely disregard the rights of his subjects. No tyrant could ever crush out of them the conviction that, if they were to be called upon to pay taxes and to provide military service, they must have a share in the government. That share, once secured, grew and grew until representation has become the dominant principle not only in the British Parliament, but in every nation, state, city or village which Englishmen planted or their sons now govern. This principle leads straight to Democracy—that political ideal which, beyond all others, acknowledges the obligation of making of every member of the state a citizen, and of giving all citizens liberty and equality at the voting-booth and in the courts.

But Anglo-Saxon Democracy would not be what it is, if it had not been worked out in a spirit peculiar to our race—the spirit which manifests itself in honorable compromise and in great-souled toleration. Compromise, which is not to be confounded with the base truckling, log-rolling and dishonest bargains of the politicians, has been found by long experience to be the best method by which most necessary improvements can be secured—and kept. The free political evolution of a people should be a growth; if it be not this, it may be a succession of conflicting whims and ambitions, violent but not deep, in which individuals and cliques take the place of parties and principles. To accept a compromise in cases where conscience sanctions it has been the Anglo-Saxon way: and party government, in which first one side and then the other makes the laws,—and thereby in the long run both sides record their principles on the statute-book—is also, in essence, a form of compromise.

With this has grown up toleration, the willingness to respect an adversary's opinion, the recognition that the general intellectual and moral health of a country is best served by allowing free play to all sorts of creeds and thinkers, if they do not seek to destroy society itself. Toleration did not spring up and flourish among Anglo-Saxons in a moment; but the conscience of our race accepted it long before conduct, which lags behind good resolutions, was generally practising it. And although England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was shaken by dynastic, religious and civil wars, she organized no Inquisition to take, like Frankenstein's monster, a terrible vengeance on its creator; she furnished no counterpart to the wholesale expulsion of the Huguenots from France or of the Moriscoes from Spain; and now, for above two hundred years, she has seen the representatives of her chief interests and the upholders of antagonistic political theories sit side by side at Westminster, in tolerance, if not in harmony. And America in this respect has not fallen short of the Mother's example. Less than half a century ago, our country was torn by a civil war whose causes had roots too deep for compromise, in two incompatible, mutually destructive civilizations. Yet, when the issue had been fought out, there followed no proscriptions, no batches of victims for the scaffold, no hosts of exiles, no legalized sequestrations, no multitudes rotting in political prisons.

Now, these great Anglo-Saxon principles and Democracy itself were most nobly embodied during the nineteenth century in Abraham Lincoln. Nothing could destroy his belief in popular government. Neither the abuse of enemies, nor the harsh criticism of friends, nor military defeats nor political defection could turn or embitter or disconcert him. He, indeed, probably to a greater degree than any other ruler in history, kept steadily before him the realization that the interests of all the people were his sacred charge. He would practise compromise up to the very line where compromise ceases to be a virtue. His large tolerance had malice toward none and charity for all. And he possessed to the full the Anglo-Saxon respect for law as the means to the protection of every individual, no matter how humble, and to the equal and impartial distribution of justice. Among the Latin peoples and the Germans the law is feared, rather than respected, because it has served as the instrument for punishment or restraint, instead of for protection; an ally of the hated police and of despotic governments. But Lincoln in this regard truly represented our race: and when through the exigences of a colossal war he had thrust upon him powers which were practically unlimited, he used them lawfully, aiming only at justice, righteousness and charity. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that he showed how even a dictatorship may be constitutional.

The British world may unite with America, therefore, in celebrating Abraham Lincoln as the pattern and exemplar of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fundamental political ideals of our Anglo-Saxon race. Wherever men would learn the type of citizen and ruler, of law-giver and law-abider, which Anglo-Saxon Democracy reveres, they may turn to him. Democracy, which was but a germ in the Witenagemot, and but a tender shoot at Runnymede, came to its fruit in him.

And so Charles Darwin summed up what I believe to be the noblest intellectual characteristics of our race. He was not merely an indefatigable investigator and a penetrating observer, not merely slow to assert and quick to listen to criticism, but he was modest, generous and utterly truthful. Unlike many great men of science, he was neither opinionated nor doctrinaire: and he loved truth, even when it seemed to imperil his theory. When we think of him, there does not rise up the figure of the typical *Gelehrter*—the astonishing specialist, and nothing more—but of a great personality that included (but was not hemmed in by) the master scientist. His honesty, his candor, his quiet courage, his magnanimity, his large simplicity and sound humanity, in a word, his moral qualities, added—who can say how much?—to his intellectual efficiency. Darwin was as solicitous to be just to every fact as Lincoln was to treat every man and every opinion with perfect fairness: and they did so without any apparent urging by conscience. Their acts were so shaped by the habit of duty that they seemed inevitably righteous.

Looked at from one point of view, the chief effort of men during the past four hundred years has been to try to *rationalize* the world in which we live. This they have accomplished by discovering its processes and the laws which govern them. The Ultimate Cause still eludes pursuit, but we know and control our actual world as men never did before. At all points it seems to behave reasonably in proportion as our reason has mastered it. Steam, for instance, which, until so short a time ago, was only a tricksy vapor, to be whiffed away with the first breath, now furnishes most of the power by which civilized nations manufacture and travel. Electricity, also, still more elusive, and invisible besides, has been rationalized. And so of everything.

Darwin is the embodied Reason, seeking its own in the material world, and especially in organic life. He finds a larger order, where there were caprice, partial chaos and ignorance. He divines a cosmic law to replace primitive legends. He is afraid of nothing—not even of the Truth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The obligation which life in a rationalized world imposes upon us is to be rational ourselves, to respect and train our reason so that we may trust it, and above all to cleave to truth. When systems dissolve, the only salvation for each individual is to believe what to him is the highest truth. For in such times, "canned" beliefs, put up by institutional packing-houses, no longer nourish.

Charles Darwin stands as the great prototype of modern Truth-seekers, Truth-speakers, and Truth-reverers. They are found now in every land, in every trade, profession and calling. But though his doctrines and disciples are spread throughout the earth, he belongs to our common Anglo-Saxon race, and Americans, not less than Englishmen, should honor his centennial.

If, as some of us hope, the allied mission of England and of the United States is but beginning,—if the principles which found expression in the development of both nations,—if the ideals which have been held by both peoples,—if the works of genius which, thanks to a common language, are the inheritance of every Englishman and of every American,—have not lost their potency, then let us draw closer together, and recognize more clearly our indelible kinship and our common destiny. The fluctuations of friendship and hostility which newspapers, politicians and designing ministers try to create can have no effect against nations conscious of the deepest racial sympathies. On these alone, we cannot too often repeat, the durable international alliances must rest. The bonds of commerce should make for peace and amity, but these bonds a sudden strain of competition may snap: at their strongest, they are only tow compared with the intellectual, moral and spiritual affinities that bind the souls of a race together. Just as the friendship of man and man, or the love of man and woman, depends neither on wealth nor physical qualities, but on ideals, so has it ever been, so will it always be, with nations.

The United States and England have to-day these reasons for friendship. Other nations, other races have pressed forward, each with its different principles, methods and ambitions. Let our Anglo-Saxon peoples declare February Twelfth the holiday of their race, and celebrate together Lincoln, the embodiment of Anglo-Saxon devotion to Justice, and Darwin, the incarnation of Anglo-Saxon devotion to Truth.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SWIFTNESS AND CERTAINTY OF JUSTICE IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

BY FRANCIS M. BURDICK, DWIGHT PROFESSOR OF LAW IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THE lame and halting gait of American justice has become a matter of frequent comment and regret, even by the learned persons whose business it is to dispense it. Quite recently a Supreme Court Judge of New York, on his return from England, was reported by the daily press to have said that "England's justice is much swifter than ours." Referring to a murder trial, which he attended in London, and which lasted but a day, he declared that "in this country it would have lasted a week." Similar opinions have been expressed by other judges, as well as by practising lawyers, who have watched the trial of cases in English courts. But a few months since a committee of the Alabama State Bar Association sent out a circular containing some very suggestive statistics, from which it appears that there are twelve times as many homicides in New England annually as in London; seventy-five times as many in California, and two hundred and forty-five times as many in Nevada. Commenting on these statistics, the committee said: "It is believed that the certainty and swiftness of justice in England and the lack of them in the United States account, in a large measure, for the wide difference in the number of crimes in the two countries."

That a very marked difference in the swiftness and certainty of justice between England and the United States does exist admits of no doubt. It was emphasized—perhaps unduly exaggerated for most persons—by the Thaw and Rayner murder trials. In each case the evidence of the killing by the accused was undisputed, and the only legal defence was that of the prisoner's insanity at the time of the homicide. The Rayner

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial occupied but a single day, resulting in conviction, while the first trial of Thaw dragged its weary length through more than seven weeks to the impotent conclusion of the jury's disagreement.

In commenting on these trials the London "Law Journal" of March 30th, 1907, said:

"English judges and juries do not listen with patience to arguments about degeneracy or brain-storm as excuses for not bringing home responsibility for taking the lives of others. . . . To an English lawyer the Thaw trial reads like a travesty or abuse of the common law procedure . . . a mock trial prepared for the entertainment of the curious in mental abnormities, rather than a judicial investigation into a question of fact. Comparison of the two systems indicates that the English system, with its modern improvements, coupled with the effective control of the presiding judge, affords the better means of vindicating public justice in a manner becoming the dignity of the offended law."

Of the first Thaw trial a Scotch lawyer wrote to a friend in this country:

"It is a great case, but not nearly so great as your American methods of procedure. . . . You make too much of counsel. It is really Jerome's and Delmas's acts that are on trial, with Thaw's future as a kind of by-product of the experiment. . . . Your system is a cumbersome device for wasting decent men's time and swelling lawyers' heads."

It was intimated a moment ago that these cases may exaggerate the difference which really exists between the two countries in respect of the swiftness of justice. Undoubtedly, had Rayner been rich and able to employ numerous and distinguished counsel, they might have prolonged his trial a little even in England. On the other hand, if Thaw had been poor, and, especially, if the killing had been of his putative father, because he refused to support him, instead of Stanford White for the reasons assigned by his counsel, his trial would have been greatly abridged even in New York City. But if the records of these cases are not entirely fair specimens of the difference in swiftness, they do well illustrate the difference in certainty. Rayner could not appeal from his conviction. Had Thaw been convicted he could have appealed to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court; from an affirmance of the conviction in that tribunal to the Court of Appeals; and, if the ingenuity of counsel could discover any Federal question in the proceeding, the final determination might have been still further delayed by carrying the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, upon an appeal the conviction might have been set aside and a new trial ordered for some trifling error on the part of the trial court in admitting or excluding evidence, or in giving or refusing certain instructions to the jury, or in construing the pleadings, or in applying a rule of practice. This might be done for a *trifling* error, we have said. New trials are continually awarded in this country for such errors. The theory which generally prevails in our courts is that one who appeals from the verdict of a jury, whether in a criminal or a civil case, is not bound to show that an error of the trial court was actually harmful to him. It is for the other party to show that it was harmless; that it did not and could not have affected the verdict. As a result, new trials are granted in this country with extravagant frequency. It is said that upwards of five hundred a year are recorded in our judicial reports, as against not more than five in England. Another authority declares that during the decade of 1890-1900, of the causes appealed in England, new trials were granted in less than three and one-half per cent., while in this country new trials were granted in forty-six per cent. An eminent writer on the law of evidence refers to a single volume of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in which several criminal cases are reported on appeal for a second or third time; and in all but one a conviction was reversed for errors which were merely technical. In two of the cases, the criminal afterwards pleaded guilty, while in a third the accused was again, and this time finally, convicted of murder. The American doctrine, that harm to the defeated party is to be presumed from error of any kind committed by the trial judge, operated in those cases, as it has operated in countless others, only to delay justice and bring it into popular contempt.

This contempt for our system of judicial trials and appeals has come to be reckoned one of the chief causes of mob violence in this country. Lynch law, writes Hannis Taylor, of constitutional-law renown, "may be defined to be the indignant outcry of a conservative, law-loving people against a system of criminal procedure which has become notoriously deficient."

In referring to the Rayner case, it was said that the defendant could not appeal from his conviction. Since that trial, Parliament has passed a statute providing for appeals from criminal judgments. Such appeals, however, are not to be free and un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bridled; and they are to be subject to the rule, which has long governed appeals in civil cases in England, that a new trial is not to be granted for errors of procedure unless, in the opinion of the appellate court, such errors have occasioned some substantial wrong or miscarriage of justice.

The substitution of this rule for that generally prevailing with us has been advocated of late by many and powerful voices. Judge Amidon, President Roosevelt, Secretary Taft, the Alabama State Bar Association and a host of others have urged the change. Judge Amidon, in an address which has been widely published and discussed, declares that, under the operation of this rule, "no cause has appeared for the second time in an appellate court in England for more than thirty years." He also quotes the official statement of Sir John McDonald that, of the five hundred and fifty-five cases brought before the Court of Appeal for review in 1904, only seven were sent back for a new trial!

There seems to be no doubt that English justice is surer, as well as swifter, than the justice meted out in our courts.

Nor can there be any doubt that the prevailing American rule has developed in the trial lawyer a disposition to exalt matters of practice above matters of substance, to think more of technicalities than of the merits of the case. "In so far as I have been able to observe," Judge Amidon recently told an assemblage of lawyers, "there are two motives that animate each lawyer in the trial of a cause in our courts: get a victory if you can, but under no circumstances fail to get error into the record." Such was certainly the dominant motive of counsel for a railroad company, who, when asked by the judge how much time he wished for summing up, replied: "I do not care to address the jury, your Honor. I have two objections to your Honor's rulings, which are perfectly fatal to any judgment that may be rendered against my client. It is, therefore, a matter of indifference to me what verdict the jury brings in."

But would the adoption of the English rule governing new trials result in the reform hoped for by its advocates?

The matter was discussed at length by the New York State Bar Association in 1907. In his usually lucid and persuasive style, the late Dean Huffcut argued for the substitution of the English rule; and a number of eminent lawyers supported a resolution requesting the Committee on Law Reform to embody

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its spirit in suitable amendments to the New York Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure. The proposed reform was strenuously opposed, however, with the result that the whole matter was tabled by a vote of nearly two to one.

Whoever reads the official report of this discussion will be struck by the fact that the opponents of the change were unwilling to trust judges with the power which the English rule gives them. One gentleman said that the rule might be a safe one, possibly, in England, where barristers try cases without attempting to get in evidence which they know to be incompetent, and where "men of eminent legal attainments sit as judges; but it is not a safe rule here, before gentlemen that are nominated by bosses, before gentlemen of such gracious character and good nature that they do not want to displease anybody." Another opponent declared that, instead of the amendment proposed, he would favor one requiring trial courts to be provided with "phonographs to take the tone of the judge's voice, and that we should except to his tone," if that conveyed to the jury the judge's real opinion of the case.

It must be admitted that these speeches fairly represent a very large body of public opinion. Although no candid person denies that the American bench includes, and has long included, some of the ablest and most honorable members of the legal profession, men whose motives are above suspicion and whose judgment is sound and sane, yet, as a rule, the judges of our highest courts do not command the respect of the bar and the reverence of the community in the measure in which these are accorded to their brethren in England.

Let us inquire into the causes of this difference; for such inquiry may help us to a better understanding of the reasons for the superior swiftness and certainty of English justice.

One of the causes, we submit, is to be found in the different modes of selecting judges in the two countries. In England, they are appointed by the Lord Chancellor. While he is a member of the cabinet, and his selection is determined by considerations which are partly political, no doubt, no modern Prime Minister has dared to name an unfit, or even mediocre, lawyer for this place. Accordingly, when judicial vacancies occur or additional judges are authorized, it is an eminent lawyer, of wide acquaintance and long experience at the bar, who appoints the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incumbents. If these appointees are unfit, the blame is focused upon the Lord Chancellor. He cannot escape censure or even divide it with others. How effectively this undivided responsibility operates was apparent, last summer, when an influential body of Liberal Members of Parliament sought in vain to induce Lord Loreburn to displace Conservative local magistrates with Liberal candidates. It was noticeable again, when Parliament authorized the appointment of an additional judge of the King's Bench. Although opinions differed as to the desirability of an additional judge, all parties expressed confidence that the appointment would be beyond criticism.

In most of our States, judges are elected by popular suffrage. Of this practice, Mr. Bryce has said: "Nearly everywhere the elections are influenced by political considerations; and a man not belonging to the dominant party, and not agreeable to its managers, has little chance of success." One would not expect that, as a rule, men distinguished for judicial temper and legal attainments would be the persons selected by this process for the Bench. Nor should one be surprised that, ever and anon, a Judge Cooley is relegated to private life, after twenty years of eminent judicial service, because of the superior vote-getting qualities of a judicially inexperienced opponent.

Federal judges, it is true, and those in some of the States, are appointed by the Chief Executive; but, as a rule, his authority is not exclusive. He appoints "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" or similar body. Sole responsibility for unsuitable appointees cannot be fixed upon him; and, in many cases, without doubt, the blame is fairly divisible among an indefinite number of official and unofficial persons.

Again, judicial salaries in England are so generous as to command for the Bench the highest order of legal talent. The Lord Chancellor receives £10,000 annually;* the Lord Chief Justice, £8,000; Lords of Appeal and the Master of the Rolls, £6,000 each, and the Lord Justices £5,000 each. Even the County Judges have a salary of £1,500. On this topic Goldwin Smith writes, in his "History of England":

"The salaries of English judges are large; but the money is well spent in placing on the Bench men who have full command over their

* Of this sum £4,000 is payable for his services as Speaker of the House of Lords.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courts, and can make justice swift as well as respectable and sure. That underpayment of public servants and judges is false economy America has good reason to know."

These salaries are in striking contrast with those paid American judges. Even in New York County, where judges receive the highest compensation in America, their salaries are but a trifle more than three-fifths of the amount paid officials of like rank in England, while the salary of a Federal Supreme Court Justice is less than half of that of an English Lord of Appeal; and in some of our States judges of the highest court receive but one-tenth the salary of the Master of the Rolls. It is not surprising, therefore, that the leaders of our bar are seldom aspirants for judicial honors; while it often happens that men of the greatest usefulness on the Bench feel compelled to resign in order to provide for themselves and their families.

Another respect in which the position of the English judge differs from that of his American brother is the tenure of office. In England he is appointed for life, subject to removal by the Crown only upon an address of both Houses of Parliament. It is true that our Federal Judges and those of a few States hold office during good behavior; but in most of our Commonwealths they are not only chosen by popular suffrage, but for a short term of years. The youngest member of our Union has fixed the term of office for County Judges at two years, for District Judges at four years, and for Supreme Court Judges at six years. Leaders of the Independence League declare that it is of the highest importance that judges should be elected for short terms, in order to keep them constantly conscious of their responsibility to the people.

Which of these plans tends to secure the greatest judicial independence? This is the answer of Goldwin Smith:

"Since the independence of the English judiciary was secured, the purity of the ermine has been preserved. To this great principle America has been less faithful than England; for, if the judge holds office not during good conduct, but at pleasure, as he does when he has to look for re-election, it signifies little whether the pleasure is that of a king, or that of a political party styling itself 'the people.'"

A similar answer is found in the Constitution of Massachusetts in these words:

"It is the right of every citizen to be tried by judges as free, impartial and independent as the lot of humanity will admit. It is,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, not only the best policy, but for the security of the rights of the people and every citizen, that the judges of the Supreme Judicial Court should hold their offices as long as they behave themselves well."

Can any one doubt the soundness of this answer? To make the choice of a judge depend upon popular suffrage, and then to make his term short in order to keep him constantly conscious of his responsibility to the people, is the best way to convert him into a mere politician. Nothing could be better suited than this to turn his mind from the true solution of the problems of "gladsome jurisprudence," and to develop within him the arts of the demagogue. It is to the everlasting credit of the American judiciary that more of its members have not succumbed to this insidious temptation.

Allusion has been made to the great authority exercised by the English judge in the trial of cases. Nothing is more sure than this to arrest the attention of an American lawyer who happens to watch an English trial. The judge is not the mere umpire of a game, in which the chief actors are the counsel for the litigants. He has full control of the proceeding. Last summer the writer attended the trial of an important libel suit in London before the Lord Chief Justice and a jury. His first surprise was at the few objections raised by counsel, and the almost entire absence of exceptions to rulings, as well as of wrangling between counsel. He was prepared for the deference shown to the court by counsel, for he knew that Sir Richard Webster had long been a leader of the English bar before he was elevated to the Chief Justiceship and the title of Lord Alverstone. There was no need, no pretext and no precedent for the lawyers placing such a judge on trial to find out how much law he knew, as an American judge has recently said is the general practice here. The English judge is pretty sure not to need education at the hands of the bar, even of its most distinguished leaders.

In the progress of the trial referred to, the defendant became a witness in his own behalf. On his cross-examination, a question was put which he answered, and he at once launched out into an explanation. The cross-examiner objected; but, upon the court's ruling that the witness might proceed, no exception was noted. Some minutes later, the foreman of the jury rose, and protested to the court against their time being wasted with such imma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terial statements. Lord Alverstone remarked that he could not see how the evidence was material, but he thought the witness might proceed; and neither jury nor counsel again interposed. When the judge came to charge the jury, he not only set forth the rules of law which were to govern their decision, but he gave them a perfectly frank statement of his own views as to various matters of fact; while, of course, advising them that their findings upon these matters were not to be controlled by his opinions. The result was a speedy verdict for £3,000 against the defendant.

In no class of cases has the influence of the English judge been more marked than in civil actions for libel. This was conspicuously manifest in the Soap Trust Libel Case, last summer (of Lever Brothers, Limited, against the Associated Newspapers, Limited, for publications in the "Daily Mail" and the "Evening News," of London), when the defendants assented to the return of a verdict for £50,000—the largest ever given in a libel suit. It is true that the defendants withdrew their plea of justification and terminated the trial at the conclusion of the plaintiff's evidence, but that was largely, if not wholly, due to the strictness with which an English judge holds defendants to the simple issue of libel, the certainty of the legal rules which he expounds to the jury, and the unhesitating manner in which he expresses his own opinions to them. In the Lever Case, Mr. Justice Lawrence remarked, in approving the course of defendants' counsel: "If I had been called upon to deal with these articles and there had been nothing more to justify them than appeared in the cross-examination, I should have felt it my duty to have expressed myself in no hesitating or measured language as to the character of these articles." What lawyer of distinction in this country would have advised a trust magnate, in similar circumstances, to bring a civil action for libel against an association of newspapers, with any well-grounded hope of securing a verdict of $250,000 for his client?

In some of our States, the authority of the trial judge is narrowly limited by constitutional provision. For example, the Constitution of Arkansas (Art. VII, Section 23) prescribes that "Judges shall not charge juries with regard to matters of fact, but shall declare the law." The Supreme Court of that State has referred to the provision as due to "seeming jealousy of the influence of the Bench," and has held that it precludes the judge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from characterizing evidence given upon the trial as weak or strong! Similar constitutional provisions are found in California, Nevada, South Carolina, Tennessee and Washington; while in other States limitations of like character are imposed by legislation. A statute of Maine declares that the expression of a judge's opinion on a matter of fact in his charge to a jury is cause for a new trial. The Code of Iowa forbids the court to limit "the argument of counsel in cases tried by a jury."

The judges in other States and in the Federal courts are not subject to positive enactments of this character; and the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that the trial "judge is not a mere moderator of a town meeting, submitting questions to a jury for determination, nor simply ruling on the admissibility of testimony, but one who in our jurisprudence stands charged with full responsibility." Still, in most of these tribunals, the judge finds it easier and more popular to act as a mere moderator. Indeed, Judge Amidon of the Federal Bench said to the Minnesota Bar Association not long ago: "I think, as a rule, gentlemen, you like the judge best who keeps his hands off. I have heard some of you say that." Nor has the accuracy of that statement been challenged, so far as the writer has learned.

To act well the part assigned to the English trial judge requires an abundance of legal learning and experience, high character, unflinching courage, willingness to take responsibility as well as to exert every effort in order that justice may be swiftly and surely administered in his court. A less generous outfit will suffice for an American judge of the ease-loving and popularity-seeking sort.

Again, English judges (save the Lord Chancellor) hold themselves aloof from active participation in partisan politics. Last summer, the Lords of Appeal rarely took part in the discussion of bills before the House of Lords, which involved questions of party politics only. On the few occasions when one or two did enter the party lists, they were severely rebuked by the Ministerialists, and received but lukewarm commendation from the Conservatives. Indeed, such conduct is generally defended, if at all, on the ground that the particular question transcends party politics, and involves the safety of the State.

Our judges are not equally careful to withdraw their hands from the political machine to which they owe their eleva-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to the Bench. It is not accounted scandalous for a judge to preside over a partisan campaign meeting, or to permit his friends to urge his nomination to a political office. Indeed, in States where the term of judicial office is brief, it often happens that a judgeship is accounted a regulation round in the ladder of political preferment.

Still another reason why our judges do not command such universal reverence as is accorded to their English brethren is that the latter are not required to pronounce upon the constitutionality of statutes. An Act of Parliament may change the British Constitution, but cannot be in legal conflict with it. An Act of Congress or of a State Legislature, which is repugnant to the Federal or State Constitution, is no part of the law of the land. Whether it is so repugnant, and hence nugatory, is for the judiciary to decide. It is in the exercise of this high power that the American judge most frequently antagonizes an intense and, it may be, an unreasonable public opinion. It is at such times that the true metal of the judge is tested and disclosed. If he is worthy of his exalted position, he will be unmoved by considerations of personal advantage, and will decide the question before him in accordance with his understanding of established legal rules. Neither the criticism of legislators and of executive officers, nor the clamor of the masses, will swerve him from the fearless discharge of his sworn duty. It is gratifying to know that the American judiciary, as a whole, has discharged this duty well—so well, indeed, that a school of modern political agitators is demanding that the duty shall be abolished; that the function of declaring laws unconstitutional shall be withdrawn from the judiciary, and that judges shall be elected for short terms in order that they shall be constantly conscious of their responsibility to the people. It is a favorite charge of this school that existing judges do not construe the laws impartially, but, on the other hand, are sure to declare a statute "unconstitutional which tends to bring powerful interests to account and to equality before the law." Another favorite phrase is that the bent of the present judicial "mind leads to decisions which are contrary to the good of the State and the welfare of the citizens." In other words, our judges are impeached as unfair and unsafe; and also as arrogating to themselves legislative and executive functions, whenever they declare a statute unconstitu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional. Such judges are to be eliminated, and, hereafter, those only are to be chosen who can be depended upon to uphold and apply the will of the majority, when it takes the form of a statute, however repugnant it may be to those time-honored safeguards of persons and property which have been established by the common law and written constitutions.

In striking contrast with this growing spirit of criticism and suspicion is the attitude of the English public towards their judges. This was shown during the period of agitation which followed the famous Taff Vale decision by the House of Lords. Immediately, Trade-Unionists and many others called for the enactment of a statute which should alter the legal rule laid down in that case, under which the funds of the Unions could be taken in satisfaction of judgments for boycotts declared and sustained by their leaders. But no demand was made for a new set of judges. Indeed, John Burns declared at a Hyde Park meeting, while the excitement was highest, that he "wished workingmen to hold the view he held, that the British judiciary was the best in the world." Directly after the Parliamentary elections of 1906, the Labor Party formulated its legislative demands, but the document contained not a word of distrust of the judiciary, nor an intimation of need for change in its constitution or character.

More than a generation ago, the present Ambassador from Great Britain to the United States assured his English readers that "the first condition for understanding the judicial arrangement of America is to get thoroughly rid of the English conception of a Judge." According to his outline of that conception, English judges are among the greatest permanent officials of the State. They enjoy large incomes and great social respect. On their circuits they are received with the ceremonious pomp of the Middle Ages. The public press rarely assails their ability and never their fairness. And they command universal popular reverence.

Is it not probable that this traditional attitude of the public towards the English judge has powerfully contributed to the development of his ability to administer justice with a swiftness and certainty not attained in the United States?

FRANCIS M. BURDICK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME WOMEN OF PINERO'S.

BY WILLIAM H. RIDEING.

Mr. Pinero gives the predominant place in nearly all of his serious plays to women, and though he often uses the foibles of minor characters as "comic relief," his protagonists always uphold the subtlety of the sex and emphasize its tragedy. They dominate those who surround them, and in disaster they compel our compassion though they may not evoke our approval.

It is apparent to all who read or see his plays that to him a sexless world would be a world without drama, and therefore a dull world. The problems of the sexual relationship absorb him, and judicial and unpartisan as his intention towards both may be, it is nevertheless discernible that at heart he is more of an apologist than an arbiter where women are concerned. He deserves far more thanks than he receives from those of his feminine critics who regard him with no more friendliness than the impaled wasp feels for the professor scrutinizing it through a magnifying glass.

His attitude towards the sex is never wanting in respect or in the deference of fine chivalry. He does not satirize, or patronize, or condescend: women are to him in these serious plays the chief sufferers in the tangle of human life; and, in the hackneyed phrase of the day, it is they who "pay" a disproportionate penalty through their bodies and through their souls for delinquencies and misfortunes not wholly of their own creation.

We have but to look at the plays themselves for illustrations of his position, and in them may be found sufficient evidence that his intention is not to gibe or to parodize, as Mr. Bernard Shaw does, with the eyes of the peeping satyr who surprises the nymph in the bath, but to measure fairly and to insist that what is condoned in a man shall not be condemned in a woman.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mrs. Ebbsmith I pass, for she seems to me to be one of the least convincing of all his characters and the play the least satisfying of his mature work. His plot blows in the wind, and his people are elusive and dubious, the puppets of a good artificer rather than the breathing and consistent figures he usually creates for us. At the end one feels that he has done less than he expected to do, and that he must be as unsatisfied as his audience is when it puts the book down after reading it, or hurries out of the theatre when the curtain falls.

We all know Paula, the second Mrs. Tanqueray; and it is probably superfluous to do more than mention a character who has been discussed so much, and who, at least once a year, revisits the stage. Without disparaging the play itself, I believe that it endures as it does because Mr. Pinero found in Mrs. Campbell the one woman who could fit the part and be it.

Paula's doom is foreseen as soon as we hear of her, and we know equally well that she must drag her husband down with her as she sinks. There is no lottery in such a marriage as theirs. There can be but one end to it, and that tragical. "She is a young woman of about twenty-seven; beautiful, fresh, innocent-looking." So the author describes her in the stage directions when she first appears, just after the little farewell dinner Tanqueray has been giving to his friends in his chambers—a scene which is sombre with the presage of what is to come and as fateful as the knocking at the gate in "Macbeth." But the innocence is counterfeit and the freshness the freshness of a callous heart. Tanqueray's infatuation for her does not justify itself. He has lost in his first wife a bride of ice, and he espouses, in the second, one whom he expects to be a bride of fire. But her fire does not burn clearly: it is fitful and smoky, and all his patience and coaxing are insufficient to produce the steady glow he has hoped for; the end is ashes. He is not impelled by the recklessness of youth. His spirit is temperate, his conduct deliberate. His folly is the fruit of his philosophy, and his philosophy a snare, though it at least prefers justice to convention and prudence, and claims the same indulgence for a woman as for a man.

As for Paula, she is never more than lukewarm. Under various aliases she has been the mistress of other men's establishments; but she is not reaching out her arms for salvation, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she offers him a loophole from his thraldom after handing him a letter which she had intended to post and which he burns unread—a letter confessing to one intimacy which the gossip of the town has not communicated to him:

"Read it through after I have gone, and then—read it again and turn the matter over in your mind finally. And if, even at the very last moment, you feel you—oughtn't to go to church with me, send a message to Pont Street, any time before eleven to-morrow, telling me that you are afraid, and I—I'll take the blow."

That shows that Paula, according to the English phrase, is not altogether "a bad sort." But we are not certain that her willingness to relinquish him may not be accounted for by the tepidity of her own desire to possess him. She does not recognize any sacrifice on his part in marrying her; and, later on, when they have retired to the Surrey hills, she never thinks of repaying him by abnegation and devotion. She is vain, restless, petulant, unstable, arrogant and jealous. The peace of the country disquiets her; and, instead of being all in all to each other in their hermitage as they expected to be, they find their yoke galling. The neighbors will not call on her, and that stings her, though one is obliged to ask how she or he, being sane, could look for social acceptance. She complains to him:

"You'll kill me with this life. What is my existence Sunday to Saturday? In the morning a drive down to the village with the groom to give my orders to the tradespeople. At lunch you and Ellean"—Ellean is his daughter by his first wife. "In the afternoon a novel, the newspaper: if fine another drive—*if* fine! Tea—and you and Ellean. Then two hours of dusk—then dinner—you and Ellean. Then a game of *bezique*, you and I, while Ellean reads a religious book in a dull cover. Then a yawn from me, another from you, a sigh from Ellean; three figures suddenly rise—'Good night, good night, good night!' *(Imitating a kiss)* 'God bless you, ah!' . . . And so we shall go on here, year in and year out, until the sap is run out, and we are stale and dry and withered from sheer, solitary respectability. . . . Upon my word, I wonder we didn't see that we should have been far happier if we'd gone in for the devil-may-care, café-living sort of life in town! After all, I have a set, and you might have joined it. It's true I did want—dearly, dearly—to be a married woman, but where's the pride in being a married woman among married women who are—married! If— *(Seeing that his head has sunk into his hands)* Aubrey! My dear boy! You're not—crying?"

She is moved only for a moment, and, defying him, she invites to the house to break its monotony an old associate of hers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who has married a degenerate sprig of patrician society, and whose skirts are as smirched as her own. Vulgar and illiterate, this lady declares after a few days: "Dodo [her husband] and me both consider you make a first-class hostess, but then you've had such practice, haven't you, dear?"—which, again to make use of the current English of the English, is "a nasty one."

They afford nothing more than a temporary diversion for her, and she is soon eager to be rid of them, even intimating to them that they are no longer welcome. Aubrey's love is not enough for her, and we feel sure that if the neighbors recognized her she would scorn their attentions. The greatest of her avowed grievances is that Ellean dislikes her; but, if the girl's confidence and affection could be won, they would not be prized. Of that, too, we are sure. Her unhappiness is of her own making, and there is no remedy but the one that in desperation she takes when she finds in Ellean's lover a former paramour of her own. Nothing in her life becomes her better than her leaving it; for, before she kills herself, she insists on being honest enough to her husband, cost what it may, and against all the pleadings and threats of her accomplice, to inform him of the tragic coincidence on which the curtain falls. An uncompromising individualist, she has that much courage, and not wholly despicable is the strength of her impenitence, which never softens, we infer, until she sees in the final complication the overwhelming disaster she has brought on him in his foolhardy experiment.

How does Mr. Pinero expect us to feel about her? I fear there are many who are not so lenient as he is.

As with Paula in "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," it is easy to guess what Iris will come to in the play which bears her name; but the interest of the spectator dwells less on the issue than on the ingenious analyses by which Mr. Pinero develops the character. The plots of his serious work are in an unusual and praiseworthy degree simple and logical; rarely does he depend for effect on those marvellous coincidences which from long usage the average audience accepts without feeling any strain on its abundant credulity. In "Iris" he states nothing we cannot believe in, except one situation; and, if that play is not produced as often as the other, the probable reason is in the difficulty of finding an adequate representative for the principal part. Iris has never been impersonated as she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should be; and, as the play, like all the best of Mr. Pinero's, is more than ephemeral, it may yet be recovered from the shelf on which it bides its time until the right actress is born for it.

We receive the author's conception of the part, physically, from those italicized directions in the printed play which seem so pleasantly confidential. "She is a beautiful woman, with a soft, appealing voice and movements instinct with simple grace and dignity. Her manner is characterized by a repose amounting to languor." A widow at twenty-one, she is hampered by the terms of her deceased husband's will, which deprives her of its benefits if she remarries; and, at the opening of the play, she is dallying with a penniless young man—in love with him—but unable to decide that she has the strength to exchange for liberty and poverty the gilded cage in which she is imprisoned. A sort of drawing-room Cleopatra, "a honey pot," as John Knox called Mary Queen of Scots; she fascinates men and women alike by her gentleness, her generosity and her sweetness. At least three men are in pursuit of her—the pathetic little Croker Harrington, whose passion is hopeless, but whose devotion is doglike; a millionaire, Frederic Maldonado, and Laurence Trenwith, the youth whose ineligibility lies solely in his impecuniosity. Iris, foolish in many ways, extravagant in her habits, dependent on luxuries, cannot resign herself to the little he can offer her, nor will she surrender him. Unwilling to sacrifice her legacy, she strains the respect of her friends by allowing him to be in constant attendance on her.

That he may be always near, she, heedless of scandal, offers to support him, seeing no impropriety in her suggestion, and is surprised when he declines. Against her temptation his manhood asserts itself, and he tears himself away to wrestle with the future in Western America. She loves him and him only. Is that not an answer to every cry of prudence, and to every reminder of convention? Simple as a spoiled child, always petted and always humored, she is as unable to believe that the complaisant world can ever be so unamiable as to thwart anything she has set her heart on.

On the eve of Trenwith's departure for a ranch in British Columbia, and while Iris is shivering at the thought of hardships too severe for her endurance, news comes that a defaulting trustee has dissipated her fortune, and Maldonado, who has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been dogging her about the Italian Lakes, finds his own advantage in her reverses. Jealous and inflamed by her preference for Trenwith, he no longer offers her marriage, but conspires for a better revenge through entrapping her into the unsanctioned relationship. He has always been generous and is immeasurably opulent—a master financier. Trenwith has implored her to accompany him at the eleventh hour, but she has refused because before she gives herself to him she must prove to him that adversity is a source of strength to her:

"After I have shown to you that there are other, better and deeper qualities in my nature than you have suspected, then I'll join you, Laurie. . . . Come to me then as if you had never known me—or known me but a little. Let us then learn each other, as it were, afresh. Raise up barriers between us for the delight of breaking them down. . . . So that when you come to marry me you may marry one who is a stranger to you."

Meanwhile, Mephistopheles is skulking near in the shape of the full-blooded Maldonado, who is no Tanqueray, but the creature of a passion that drives him before it like a fugitive before a prairie-fire. She thinks she is reformed and is resigned to what is before her—a few years of transit from *pension* to *pension* in France, England or Italy, till Laurence comes back for her. Maldonado appears to approve of her course, to admire her courage, but he forces on her, against her intuitions, a book of blank cheques on his bank which will be honored whenever they are presented. She tosses the book aside, afraid of the temptation; but no sooner is he gone than she is appealed to for help by another victim of the absconding attorney. To grant it out of her own purse is impossible, and also impossible to her is the refusal of succor to a friend in distress. What is wanted she gives—and signs a cheque for the amount. Her doom is sealed from this moment. Forsaken by all but Croker Harrington, himself penniless, she gradually sinks into the poverty which Maldonado has designed for her, with such confidence in her ultimate surrender that he has a smart apartment in the West End furnished for her before she succumbs:

"At last [this is to Laurence when he returns, and she describes her vicissitudes] my devices for keeping my head above water were exhausted. I had even contrived to pledge the tiny income remaining from the wreck of my affairs, and I was without a shilling—absolutely without a shilling—my clothes nearly falling off me, my shoes in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holes! I was in London again by that time; it was as if I had come home for the finish. The horrors of it! The back room in the narrow, grimy street; the regular shameful visit to the pawnbroker's; the listless mechanical stroll out in the dusk for air and exercise. . . . And one evening—he was continually tracing me and dogging my steps—one evening I met him and let him walk beside me; and—he handed me the key of this flat. They were waiting me—these pretty rooms; they had been kept prepared for me for months. That was my deepest disgrace—that he should be so certain I should find my way here."

During his absence her heart and her thoughts have been faithful to Laurence, while to Maldonado she is but an apathetic slave, sullen in her captivity. He is as much a captive to her as she is to him, and, stung by her indifference to him, is willing to surrender all—his position, his life in England—to marry her if she will give him the affection he craves:

"I love you. I love you more than ever, my dear. What's in you? You're extraordinary. By the common rule of life I ought to be chafing to be rid of you. . . . But it is not so. I say it's wonderful, considering what is behind us, that we should do as we do—I again entreating you, as I did two years back, for a soft word, a spark of warmth, just a little tenderness."

It is while she is dwelling on Maldonado's last appeal that Laurence returns, and to him she tells her story, thinking with infantile ingenuousness that he will understand it and pity her for it and take her back to him. She is penitent, and it is incredible to her that she cannot be forgiven. Her mind works like that of a culprit child, who believes that tears should wash out every sin. But Laurence is speechless in his horror. "I'm sorry—I'm sorry—I'm sorry!" is all he can say, as with a drooping head he leaves her forever.

What can she do then but accept Maldonado's offer? But she has delayed too long. He has been spying during Laurence's visit, and he bursts in upon her in a murderous rage. He points to the door, and she is bewildered. Must she go now—at once—to-night? She seems to think that now Maldonado will be as forbearing as she expected Laurence to be. Surely he will not turn her into the streets—surely not. He thanks God that his rage has restricted itself to wrecking the furniture. "I've no ambition to figure in the dock. Only I must be careful in the future. The risk is too deadly. Go! Drift back to the condition in which I found you some months ago." And as Iris staggers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out she still holds our sympathies, and without knowing why we repeat the last words of Laurence, "I'm sorry,—sorry!"

That susceptibility in Mr. Pinero which indulges and extenuates the sex, and as if by an unconscious muscular response to a mental inclination disturbs the balance of the scales, is more open to impeachment in "The Benefit of the Doubt" than in the other plays. Here we have Theophila, the young wife of a dour and priggish Scotsman, Fraser of Locheen, an awful example of the Highlander in modern society, as he may be found in and out of London, who insists on wearing kilts when they are no more appropriate than the Roman toga would be on an Italian, or a suit of chain-mail on an Englishman in a drawing-room. Theo thus complains to him:

"'Four or five months of Duncan and Hamish and their pipes! To and fro on the terrace, for a whole hour in the morning, those pipes! To and fro, up and down, all round the house, in the afternoon, those pipes! At dinner, from the trout to the banana, those pipes! And then the notion of your persistently dining in a kilt! A Highland costume on the moors—yes; but in the lamp-light—at dinner—'

"*Fraser.* 'It is my dress; I don't vary it.'

"*Theophila.* 'Think of it! A man and woman dining tête-à-tête for months and months; the woman hypped, weary; the novelty of her new clothes gradually wearing off; she feeling she is getting lean and plain with it all, salt-cellary about the shoulders, drawn and hideous—*(staring before her, her eyes dilating)*—and every blessed night the man in a magnificent evening kilt!'

"*Fraser.* 'Surely that too was "great fun" for a time?'

"*Theophila.* 'It might have been if you had the smallest sense of humor, Alec; but one soon tires of laughing alone. No, there was never any fun in that kilt. It got on my nerves from the beginning—the solemn, stupid stateliness of it. Girls are subject to creeps and crawls; I grew at last to positively dread joining you in the hall of an evening, to be frightened at giving you my arm to go in to dinner—the simple sound of the rustling of my skirt against that petticoat of yours made the chairs, everything, dance. At those moments old Duncan and his boy Hamish seemed to be blowing into the blood-vessels of my head. And during dinner even the table wouldn't help me; I was weak, hysterical—I declare to goodness I could always see through the thickness of the board—see two knees!'"

Theo must have known about the kilts and the pedantic character of their wearer from the beginning. His position is a higher one than that of her family, who are social strugglers, and she, a flirt, has been one of a triple alliance of girls called, from their intimacy in frolics, "The Three Musketeers."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finding him obstinate, she goes for sympathy to John Allingham, and is so imprudent with him that his wife, a jealous vixen, sues for separation in the Divorce Court, where the judge, describing her behavior as "hardly characteristic of a woman who is properly watchful of her own and her husband's honor," gives Theo the "benefit of the doubt." Through all the ordeal Fraser stands by her, solemnly and frigidly, not without some shock to his own faith, and a wound for which he does not reproach her, though it reveals itself in an increasing coldness towards her. After the disgraceful publicity she has brought on him she might, one thinks, allow him to decide as to the best course for their immediate future. But, though she prettily and ardently pleads her penitence, it is as one drop of syrup in the brimming glass of the wormwood which she administers in the long tirade we have quoted against the kilts and the pipes. She pictures to him a to-morrow of happiness framed to accommodate all her own preferences and whims, a bagpipeless and kiltless serenity in which she shall have her own way, as she has always had it from childhood. Her penitence and cajolery include no concession to him, but are succeeded by an arrogant insistence on the things she wants to do, whether they accord with his judgment or not. His plan is to go into seclusion abroad for a period. She will not hear of it:

"We've *got* to sit tight here in town; we've *got* to do it to win back my good name. Of course we shall be asked nowhere, but we must be seen about together, you and I, wherever it is possible for us to squeeze ourselves. There's the Opera; we can subscribe for a box on the ground tier—the stalls can't help picking you out there. And there we must sit, laughing and talking, Alec, and *convince* people that we're a happy couple, and that you believe in me implicitly. And when the Season's done with, *then* Locheen; we must have Locheen crowded with the best we can lay hands on—many that wouldn't touch me with the tongs at this moment will be glad of a cheap week or two at Locheen in the autumn. And we must let 'em all see that I'm a rattling good indoor as well as outdoor wife, and that you're frightfully devoted to me, and that what *she* charged me with—well, simply couldn't have been. And afterwards they'll go back to town and chatter, and in the end the thing will blow over, and—and— Oh, but to go abroad *now!* Alec, dear old boy, how could you dream of cutting and running *now?*"

He insists on the Continent, however, and in her rebellion she leaves the house and seeks Jack Allingham in his country cottage to say good-by to him before hiding herself she knows not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where. There her family and Fraser follow her in hot haste, and there she is discovered by the nagging Mrs. Allingham also and betrayed into a proposal that Jack shall run away with her. Mrs. Allingham condones the past, and punishes Jack enough by ransoming him for a future in which there can be no doubt that she will be the same as she has always been—a restless and unbalanced woman, a weathercock of passion, who loves and hates fitfully, and veers between abject contrition and paroxysms of rage and denunciation. Among Theo's relations and partisans are the Bishop of St. Olpherts and his wife, and they take her home to the episcopal palace with them, the inference being that under their protection she will elude censure and in the end return to her husband.

Through all the later scenes she appears as a martyr, and Mr. Pinero plainly wishes to divert all sympathy to her, despite her folly and the shame it has brought to Fraser. He is cold and unlovable — in the commonest sense of the word pragmatic. Another and more ardent and magnanimous husband might have been more generous with her, sworn to an unshaken faith in her, laughed at her escapade with an easy sense of humor and promised never to wear kilts any more. But the average man would have been as sore and quite as severe as Fraser was, expecting some docility in her and some compliance with his wishes as a condition of reconciliation. Mr. Pinero does all he can to make Fraser odious, but the Lord of Locheen, prig as he is, dry and mirthless as he is, remains a gentleman, who has chosen a wife too frisky for him. Mr. Pinero is a "hanging judge" for him, and reminds us of the magistrate in the Aberdeen court who could not control his delight as the evidence against the prisoner at the bar became more and more damning. "Peet it doon, Mr. Clerk, peet it doon!" the Scotch magistrate gleefully cried at points in the testimony which fastened the guilt on the prisoner, to whom he would turn with a shake of the head: "Ah, ma ma'an, we're getting a fine case against you, ma ma'an."

Mr. Pinero is obsessed by Theo, and obviously intends that, absolved by the Bishop, she shall return to poor Fraser as wayward and as self-willed as ever, and that he, crushed to the earth and broken in spirit by his tyrannical spouse, shall discard his kilts and banish Duncan and Hamish forever.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Pinero takes our breath away in amazement by his prodigious cleverness in epitomizing situations and characters. All that happens in "The Benefit of the Doubt" occurs between one afternoon and the next, and within that time we are familiarized with twelve people, who remain with us substantially, definitely and vividly as old friends and acquaintances.

Good as "The Benefit of the Doubt" is, it is probable that endorsement would not be lacking for a declaration that "The Gay Lord Quex" is Mr. Pinero's masterpiece. In that play also the period of action does not extend beyond twenty-four hours, and in that period all the people in it are presented with such perspicacity that before the end we know them through and through. In it the frivolity, the vanities, the insincerity and the indecencies of fashionable London are faithfully woven into the story of two wills striving for supremacy with so much ingenious, witty and unexpected strategy that the spectator follows it with consuming curiosity and suspense as to the issue, though the combatants are only a rakish marquis and a pert Cockney girl. No dramatist ever achieved more in the art of enucleation than Mr. Pinero has done in this play, which never for a moment drifts into irrelevancy or flags in its engrossing intensity. One can imagine the author polishing it over and over again, removing every excrescence, cutting it like a lapidary, turning it over from every point of view, and, with tireless endeavor for perfection, withholding it until every facet irradiates light, and he reaches the limits of his capacity for improving it.

Sophy Fullgarney is not a lady, except in the significance the word acquires by the emphasis of italics or the addition of quotation marks. Lord Quex describes her in his rage as "a low spy; an impudent, barefaced liar; a common kitchen cat who wriggles into the best room, gets herself fondled and then spits." But that is only because she thwarts him, and later his admiration for her is confessed in a handsome apology. When she spies and lies, which she does unblushingly, it is to protect her foster-sister. When she scratches, her claws, sharp as they are, do not inflict an adequate punishment. She will rather sacrifice herself than the object of her adoration. Her affection is boundless; her fealty irreversible and irreducible; her resources are equal to all the astuteness and ingenuity of her far better educated and much cooler headed adversary. Yet she is nothing more than a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common Cockney girl, pure in an impure atmosphere; sharp-tongued, but true-hearted; sophisticated in knowledge and alert in the arts of intrigue; no paragon of modesty, though militantly and impregnably chaste. How artful she is as she thrusts and parries with Quex when she seeks to betray him into a flirtatious indiscretion, in order that she may expose his character to her foster-sister!

42. 6012 29

The little manicurist is the most amusing of all Mr. Pinero's women, and is worth more than all the Theos ever born. She alone among those we have mentioned has in her the making of a normal and satisfying wife to any man chosen from her own class; and, as her betrothed is a practitioner of the allied art of palmistry, in what American newspapers call the "most fashionable and exclusive circles," and on a social and professional level with her, we are assured for once that matrimony will not be failure.

In the latest of all Mr. Pinero's plays, "His House in Order," the husband is not unlike Fraser of Locheen, and is held up to reprobation because, prim and methodical himself, he complains of such shortcomings as his wife's untidiness instead of accepting her as she is—venial in her faults, sterling in her merits. That is what he should have done; and it is what any unwashed and uncombed philosopher, not to speak of a real hero, would do spontaneously. But a neat and precise man of conventional habits strung to a woman who is careless of her appearance—who takes her dogs to bed with her! There we are sure to have trouble! An average man would bear deeper wounds with less irritation than the pricks of such a wife's loose pins. He would have to be a transcendentalist in abstraction, a stoic in endurance, and a saint in patience to keep her angelic qualities in mind while her dogs scratched themselves on her train and his knees, though better protected than Fraser's, itched under the table.

She may be an angel, but if she litters the house with loose feathers; if she does not preen herself and air her wings; if, when she rustles herself, the dust flies from her and lodges in his nose and eyes, it is not to be wondered at that he secretly wishes that she had less of heaven in her composition and more of the tangible and visible virtues of a simple and efficient housewife.

WILLIAM H. RIDEING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OUTCOME OF THE SOUTHERN RACE QUESTION.

BY ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

EVER since the earliest Colonial days two distinct centres of social and political life have existed in Anglo-Saxon America,—the South and the North; both sprung from about the same social strata in England, the bone and sinew in each case made up of yeomen and artificers, with a sprinkling of gentry. Differences, first of climate and pursuits, then of social, and especially of labor, systems early sprang up and have continued to the present day; so that the Northerner in the South and the Southerner in the North both find something unfamiliar, striking, perhaps unwelcome. Still, the mutual acquaintance and respect acquired through four years of intimate enmity, through travelling back and forth on both sides of the line, through the common interest in orders, churches, fraternities and learned societies, have gone far to break down artificial barriers. Men from the North and South may be warm, and even intimate, friends; may recognize in each other kindred aims; may stand together in the onward march of civilization; but they have different problems to solve and seem to each other to apply different standards.

Those problems are in both sections based upon labor and capital; the Northern man is perplexed by the immigrant, the trades union, the employers' association, and the trust. Most of these issues the Southern man experiences in less degree; but the vast and absorbing problem before him is that of the relation of two races: for emancipation did not remove the fundamental difficulty—the presence of a non-European race, formerly servile, and permanently inferior to the white race in capacity and power of progress. The old abolitionists, the emancipators, and the framers of the reconstruction acts, were all affected by the belief,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which seemed justified by the experience of foreign immigrants, that freedom would bring out a latent manhood, would develop a sense of responsibility. If, as many people supposed, the negro were a black white man, a belated scion of civilization, the race problem would now be very different; but forty years' experience has shown that though individual negroes, especially those having some white blood, show high capacity and some of them rise to greatness, and though most individuals of the race can profit by education, still the average of the negro race is much below that of the white race. The negroes as a people have less self-control, are less affected by ultimate advantages, are less controlled by family ties and standards of personal morality, than the average even of those white people, immigrants or natives, who have the poorest chance and are the least educated and civilized.

Alongside this race difference is a race prejudice, which, though it ultimately rests on a feeling of superiority, would probably be even more active if the races were equal. It is the feeling of the Irishman for the Hungarian, of the Southwesterner for the Mexican, intensified by the fact that the negroes have so recently been the bondslaves of the whites. This strong race feeling, from which the North is not free, is an absorbing difficulty in the South because the negroes are so widely distributed. Outside of the mountains and some hill districts, they are found in large numbers in every State, every city, and nearly every county. In the two States of Mississippi and South Carolina, they are more numerous than the whites; and in some localities, such as the Yazoo Delta in Mississippi, the Black Belt of Louisiana, and the Sea Islands, they are ten to one or even a hundred to one. Almost every community in the South, therefore, has its share in the troubles that come about from the existence of two unequally matched races living side by side; one of which has most of the property and directs the industrial enterprises, while the other furnishes the greater part of the hired labor of the South.

Some Southern writers are inclined to make little of the race question, but most intelligent people as well as the influential newspapers and periodicals not only perceive a danger but dwell upon it and expand it. The remedies proposed take on every variety of form, but may be reduced to six groups of suggestions: the remedy of fusion; the remedy of race separation; the remedy of legislation; the remedy of violence; the remedy of vassalage;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the remedy of uplift. To these various ideas in succession this article will be devoted.

I.—Remedy of Fusion.—Alongside of the conception of race superiority, and in part dependent upon it, is the well-founded belief of nearly all the whites that amalgamation would be a great misfortune for the community. Nevertheless, one hears occasionally the prediction that the mixture of the races will be the eventual outcome. A reason for this belief, which few entertain and fewer express, is the supposed experience of mankind. It is urged over and over again that history presents no example of two races living side by side indefinitely without uniting. Still more striking is the fact that there is already a partial mixture of the two races: out of the ten million people classed as negroes, probably two million have some white blood, and of these something like three hundred thousand to five hundred thousand are the children of white fathers. That miscegenation has gone on, and is still going on to an unknown degree, heightens the alarm and makes the South more determined that there shall at least be no legalized admixture of the races. Nor are examples lacking of two peoples living for centuries side by side with little mixture: Mohammedans and Hindoos, in India, have been separate for centuries; the English colonies in North America exterminated the Indians with very little race connection. Amalgamation could only be accomplished by a change in white sentiment about as probable as the Mormonization of the Northern whites; and, if it were possible, it would lead to a new and worse race question, the rivalry of a mixed race occupying the whole South against a white race in the rest of the country, which would make all present troubles seem a pleasant interlude. Amalgamation as a remedy welcomed by the Southern whites is unthinkable; as a remedy against their convictions, brought about by time, it is highly unlikely.

II.—Remedy of Race Separation.—Realizing the clash of races, a group of writers and agitators urges that the races be mechanically separated. The most obvious means would be to send the negro race out of the country, an idea now more than a century old, but hedged about with impossibilities. The first is the financial difficulty: to carry away and establish ten million people in some other part of the world would cost not less than two thousand million dollars, which must be paid by a people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depleted by the removal of ten millions of its productive population. In the second place, would a world which still has tears for the Acadians deported from Nova Scotia in 1755, be impressed with the high civilization of a nation which should send ten million people to their death in a continent where neither Briton, Frenchman, Portuguese, nor German, with all their resources, prudence and medical skill, can live? In the third place, there is not a State, city or county populous with negroes in the South which would not resent, and if need be resist, the sudden taking away of its laborers.

A milder suggestion is that the essential negro be slowly and quietly replaced by somebody else. What somebody else? Shall it be Northerners? Northern settlers in the South are few, and in any case do not replace the negro laborer for wages. Hence the only hope of a new contingent of plantation hands is in foreign immigration, which shall be vigorous enough to supersede the negro. Great efforts have been made in the last few years to induce foreigners to settle in the South: several States have set up immigration bureaus; at the immigrant station on Ellis Island immigrants are informed of the opportunities in the South; last year the government of South Carolina paid the passages of about five hundred immigrants; and a few plantations in Louisiana and Mississippi are manned by Italians or Bulgarians. Yet, so far, the whole attempt has been a failure. Outside of Texas only about five thousand immigrants landed in the South in twelve months. The few Italians who have been a few years in the country have no intention of spending their lives as plantation laborers; they work so well that they save money enough to do something that they like better. The South Carolina immigrants were so discontented, and wrote home such complaints, that the steamship companies would bring no more; and Mr. Gadsden, Commissioner of the State, reports that "Our attitude throughout the South to white labor will have to be materially altered before we can expect to have the immigrant satisfied to remain as a laborer with us."

If the negroes can neither be removed nor replaced, would the races get on more harmoniously by living in separate communities? There are many counties and a few towns into which negroes are not allowed to come; there are perhaps half a dozen negro villages in which no white man lives. Such negro towns

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(of which Mound Bayou, Mississippi, is the best known) seem to be as thriving as the neighboring white places, and furnish an opportunity for the negro professional man, banker and business man. It has been suggested that the principle might be extended by permitting the negroes to take over some State and carry it on as a negro community. The instant query is, Which State? For the whites are everywhere in the ascendant, and have not the remotest intention of abandoning any of the communities that they control.

The only other way of diminishing race pressure is the so-called "race segregation," which means that in every city and town the negroes are to occupy separate quarters, go to separate schools, ride in separate sections of the street cars, use separate sidewalks, buy in separate stores, have separate churches, places of amusement, social organizations, banks and insurance companies. Race segregation on a large scale is impossible, because the greater part of the rural negroes are dependent on white landowners and merchants for their rented land or employment or advances. The Southern business man is hardly likely to look quietly on a new commercial organization in which the negro retail trade shall go wholly to negro merchants. The thing which most ameliorates race relations is the dependence of the negro on white employers, and the dependence of many lines of business on negro custom.

III.—Remedy of Legislation.—If the races are to live side by side, cannot something be done to keep them in harmony by special legislation directed against the propensities of the lowest class? There is a movement against negro dives, some of which are loathsome places, but often with white proprietors and white customers. Perhaps an efficient vagrant law might bring upon the hopelessly idle negroes—the sponges of their race—the dread punishment of work. The vagrant laws of the South, however, play into an iniquitous system by which sheriffs make money in proportion to the number of prisoners and the length of time they spend in jail. The wave of prohibition which is now dashing over the South is due, in great part, to the conviction of employers of labor in cotton mills, in industries and on the plantations, that they lose money because their laborers are irregular and unreliable through drunkenness. If the movement is intended to shut off the stream from the white man's throat

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as from the dusky man's, it will probably increase both earnings and savings. Perhaps the legislation that is most needed is an efficient system of rural mounted police, something like the old patrols. Bills for that purpose in Georgia and South Carolina have, however, been resisted on the ground that white men might be obliged to give an account of themselves as well as negroes. The real difficulty of reform by legislation is that it does not necessarily raise the character of either element of the population, and that it very little affects the spirit of race hostility.

IV.—Remedy of Violence.—The remedy most frequently invoked in the South, most widely applied and most strenuously defended, is to terrorize the negro. Everybody knows that human life is less sacred in the South than in almost any other part of the civilized world. Fierce and ungovernable passions, assassinations and street brawls (usually miscalled duels) are shockingly frequent in both races. White men are occasionally killed by negroes, negroes are frequently killed by white men. Against the negro some public speakers and many newspapers are constantly exciting prejudice and rancor. Thomas Dixon, Jr., has in the most public manner asserted that nobody can believe that the white race "will allow the negro to master his industrial system, take the bread from his mouth, crowd him to the wall and place a mortgage on his house. . . . What will he do when put to the test? He will do exactly what his white neighbor in the North does when the negro threatens his bread—kill him." This is an incitement to murder men, not because they do ill, but because they make themselves of use to the community in which they live. Of course, the whole South cannot be held responsible for such sanguinary utterances; but upon whom shall the burden of crime be laid for the Atlanta riots of last year, in which, according to the testimony of resident white men, not one of the ten negroes killed was a criminal or so much as charged with any offence; and in which twenty white men known to be murderous rioters were indicted for misdemeanor, and not one has ever been brought to trial?

The readiest form of terror is lynching and the threat of lynching, a system about which many people in the South hold a series of conventional beliefs, many of which have been uprooted by Dr. Cutler's recent book on "Lynch Law." It seems

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be commonly believed in the South that lynching is a widely distributed practice; that it is seldom applied except to negroes, and to them only for the crime of rape. Dr. Cutler shows that, of late years, there are hardly any lynchings in the Eastern and Central States of the North; that, of 3,328 recorded lynchings from 1882 to 1903, 2,060 were of negroes, of whom 707 (an average of 32 a year) were lynched for supposed violence to women, 816 for murder, and the remainder for all sorts of offences, down to refusing to give testimony. That a community like the South, with such a proud sense of the supremacy of the white race, should be thrown into a frenzy of excitement by the deeds of less than a hundred abandoned negroes every year out of about three million adult black men, is one of the strange and terrible things in the situation; but no stranger than that for the crimes of those hundred men ten million of their race should be held responsible.

Some things, however, do not go by statistics, and the thirty or forty crimes of violence every year affright the whole white population. Perhaps something might be accomplished by special courts set up on the model of similar tribunals in slavery times, with power to deal with certain aggravated crimes outside the technicality of ordinary criminal law. If the negroes would deliver up those of their own number whom they suppose to have committed such crimes, they would do much to relieve the tension. Lynching is approved by most Southern whites, as is shown by the fact that nobody has ever been severely punished in the South for taking part in a lynching; but it is the worst and most ineffective of remedies for race troubles. Lynchings frequently degenerate into mere orgies of blood. As a young Southern white says: "You don't understand how we feel down here: when there is a row, we feel like killing a nigger whether he has done anything or not." These extraordinary remedies are not necessary if the white people of the South will make their own courts and sheriffs do their duty, insist on speedy trials and swift and orderly punishment, and disgrace and drive out of society men who take upon themselves the hangman's office.

V.—The Remedy of Vassalage.—Northerners hardly realize how different are the conditions of labor and industry in the South from those with which they are familiar at home. The Northern agricultural "hired man" frequently sits at the family

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

table; in the South there is still the relation of master and hand, and a tendency to keep the field negroes in a low and stationary condition. A large plantation is a workshop rather than a farm; rich cotton lands mean wealth only if the owner can find good laborers; but there are few planters who are willing to break up their holdings and sell them out to small farmers, because that takes away their occupation. The negro is therefore likely to be valued, not at what he can produce under the most favorable circumstances, but at the profit which he can make for his landlord or employer as a field laborer on wages.

The tendency of this system is to make the negro at best a peasant, and that is a word which is unwelcome in America. The European peasant is an hereditary laborer, usually on the land of another, who leaves it to other people to carry on the state; and that is not far from the present status of more than half the negroes in the South. The question is whether that is a permanent relation, or whether the negro will improve till he can provide for himself—work his own land or become a tenant on advantageous terms. To settle down on a peasant system would mean that the South must remain in the lower stage of economic progress which goes with such a system.

Even where the negro is working the little tract of twenty to thirty acres which is the ordinary tenant farm, or where he is on his own land, he is usually the dependent of some white man. To be sure, the same is true of the small white farmer and even of the considerable planter. The system under which a large part of the land-workers of the South have spent a year's income before their annual crop is sold, with its accompaniments of crop mortgages, debt, usury and occasional ruin, is one of the principal obstacles to the economic advance of which the South is capable, and accents race hostility.

One concomitant of the advance system is peonage, which in its mildest form means that nobody is expected to hire a negro who owes a debt to his employer unless the new master pays that debt and transfers it to himself. The negro who leaves his crop unfinished is in many cases simply pursued and brought back, without bothering sheriffs or juries. In a more aggravated form, peonage is the transfer and sale of a man's services through the operation of iniquitous laws and courts. The Southern States all, by law or constitutional enactments, prohibit im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prisonment for debt; but several of them also have laws under which the laborer who incurs a debt which he cannot pay is considered to be guilty of "false pretences" and subject to the same punishment as though he had stolen the money; being convicted, and fined as a punishment, he may then be turned over by the court to some planter to work out his fine, not unlikely to the employer with whom he has just had a row. In its worst form peonage is the virtual slavery of a man or woman who, either under color of one of these leases of convicts, or in sheer defiance of all law, is compelled to serve on terms made by his master. Nobody knows how much or how little there is of this aggravated form of peonage, but there have been a dozen or more trials and a few convictions. Nevertheless, one of those slave-keepers in Alabama—the Legree of this decade—who about two years ago whipped a woman peon to death, has never suffered the slightest punishment for that misdeed. Of all the remedies for race troubles this is the worst, both because it is a hateful perversion of the power of the superior race, and because it discourages and enrages a thousand laborers for every one whose forced labor is thus secured.

VI.—The Remedy of Uplift.—All the remedies so far suggested for the acknowledged difficulties in the South are based upon the idea that the negro can be improved only by some forcible process that is distasteful to him; but the regeneration of a race, as of mankind, must proceed from within and work outward. The most obvious remedy for race troubles is, if possible, to bring both races up to a higher plane, where thrift, intelligence and reason shall have more sway. The white race is visibly on the up grade; the old-fashioned poor white described by Olmsted, and sketched by Porte Crayon can scarcely be found anywhere in the South outside of the mountains; the backwoodsman has at last waked up to the fact that, in his turpentine, his timber, the minerals under his land, he has the elements of wealth; he is building better houses, providing better schools, raising better crops. Can the negro come up to a similar standard; and will he be allowed to reach it if he can? The general opinion of white people upon the ground is that a part of the race, probably one-fourth or one-fifth, is doing reasonably well and getting forward in the world. All over the South some negroes are buying land, which, once paid for, they cling to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with all their might. There is a wide-spread belief in the South that the negroes have retrograded since slavery times. That impression appears to be due, in large part, to the negroes in the small towns, who have left the plantations and find no steady employment such as is open to them in large cities. The negro is not industrious or steady as a domestic or an odd-job man; but on the land, in the sawmills and the turpentine forests, he works about as well as white wage-hands in similar pursuits. Somebody must have done some sort of work since 1865, in order to accumulate the five hundred millions of property which the members of the race in the South incontestably own. The negroes are not as a race crowded out of the skilled trades. In some cities, white laborers have taken their places; in others, they still do practically all the building and are engaged in a variety of trades.

Five hundred million dollars is only about a fortieth of the wealth of the South, and the negro surely needs every incitement to intelligence and thrift. While the average negro is held back by licentiousness and the night-prowling habit which seems characteristic of the race, the negro public schools, which did not get under way till after 1871, are doing much to raise the standards of the race. In 1865, probably ninety-five per cent. of the negroes over ten years of age were illiterate; now it is only about fifty per cent., and that does not tell the tale, for, among negro children of school age, nearly three-fourths can read and write, and the proportion is increasing. The Southern States provide secondary education for about fourteen thousand negroes and for about five thousand agricultural, normal and industrial students in higher institutions, besides those educated by endowed schools and colleges.

How far are these schools efficient? A favorite misapprehension in the South is the belief that classical education has somehow unfavorably affected the negro race. Inasmuch as the total number of negroes studying Greek and Latin in 1906, both in secondary and higher schools, was under two thousand, as against sixteen hundred thousand children in the common schools, it would seem that the evil has not as yet penetrated very deeply. The great defect of the colored schools is the lack of trained and intellectual teachers. The South missed its best opportunity to keep in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

touch with the negroes and carry them forward in civilization when it refused to permit the young white people to teach the negroes, as the mistresses and children had often done in slavery times. Charleston, South Carolina, is the only large city in which the teachers of the negro public schools are white women, and it can hardly be supposed that those teachers inculcate doctrines of social equality in the minds of their pupils. Education is not a panacea for any race or country; there are educated white men in Sing Sing and proprietors of bucket-shops can read, write and cipher; but a large Mississippi planter says: "You cannot send these people out to fight the battle of life hopelessly ignorant—you cannot, through the helplessness of ignorance, make him the slave of every white man, with no master's protection to shield him."

The capacity of the negro race to take on higher education is contested, though there cannot be any doubt that many mulattoes and some full-bloods have shown high powers of acquisition, forcible use of the mother tongue, and great capacity of personal leadership. The immediate race issue is whether the ordinary, average negro shall be allowed to take on that degree of education, and exercise that degree of self-control and thrift, of which he is capable. There is a school of Southern writers which frankly asserts that the real danger is that the negro will do well. As Thomas Dixon, Jr., says: "Make the negro a scientific and successful farmer, and let him plant his feet deep in your soil, and it will mean a race war." This astonishing doctrine appears to rest upon the delusion that the prosperity of the negro race must somehow be at the expense of the white people. The experience of mankind, the development of the North, shows that, where the working classes are most intelligent and most productive, the other classes of society are most advantaged. In a community where at present the whites, who are two-thirds of the population, hold thirty-nine fortieths of the property, the better off the negro becomes the more likely he is to furnish business and profit for the white people. There is no reason in the nature of things why thrifty negroes and prosperous whites should be more hostile to each other than ignorant negroes and unprogressive whites.

That there is an element in the South, numerous and outspoken, which distinctly hates the negro, would like to drive him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of the country, and, failing that, wants to keep him in a condition of economic dependence, is shown by the speeches and articles of a few recognized champions of white supremacy, and still more by the expressions of a multitude of white men who live in the midst of negroes. The assistant manager on a plantation, whose livelihood depends on raising a good crop, is exasperated because the negroes do not produce more, and has nothing but ill to say of them; but alongside this class stands a great body of thinking Southern people, who seek the elevation of both races and especially of that which needs it most, not only on philanthropic and religious grounds, but because they believe that the prosperity of the South depends on developing more efficient labor. There is a great cohort of plantation owners, large employers, progressive and public-spirited members of bench and bar, enlightened clergy, college professors, thoughtful business men, who believe, as much as the negro hater, that the race is inferior to the white race, which disclaims and abhors a mixture of the races, yet which expects the negro to remain, to improve, and to help to build up the community. At present that element seems to be dominant in the South.

The Southern problem is thus brought down in its last analysis to the simple question whether the two races can permanently live apart and yet together. That depends, in the first place, on the capacity of the negro to improve far enough to take away the reproach now heaped upon him; and, in the second place, on the willingness of the whites to accept the deficiencies of negro character as a part of the natural conditions of the country, like the infertility of some of the Southern soil, and to leave to him the opportunity to make the most of himself.

In a word, the remedy is patience. Dark as things look in the South, it is subject to the mighty forces of self-interest, of the spirit of humanity, of practical Christianity; if they are applied to the problem, it is not insoluble. The races can live alongside each other, and co-operate, though one be superior to the other. The superiority only throws the greater responsibility on the upper race. Nobody has given better advice to the South than Senator John Sharp Williams: "In the face of this great problem, it would be well that wise men think more, that good men pray more, and that all men talk less and curse less."

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOO MUCH SUCCESS.

BY EDWARD S. MARTIN.

THE fortunate people—the truly fortunate—are not so much those who succeed in life as those who succeed in living. There are some who do both; many who do neither, and some who do either one, but not the other. Success in life, so called, can be overdone, but hardly success in living. It seems possible to succeed too much in various lines of attainment legitimate and sincerely profitable in themselves, but success in living involves getting the most out of life, not in a day or a year or a decade, but in a lifetime. That involves living wisely, and you can't live too wisely. If you could, and did, it would be unwisdom, and that would be a contradiction in terms.

Of course, succeeding too much is not, and is not likely to be, a common mistake. Comparatively few people ever get a chance to fall into it. The great majority of adventurers don't succeed enough. To succeed notably calls for qualities that are rare; very valuable qualities, most of them. Yet there are familiar cases of success so commonly held to have been overdone that consideration of them will at least be helpful to discussion. The basis of the prevailing jealousy of trusts and corporations is the feeling that some of them have succeeded too much. Those that have failed—a great number—have not excited jealousy. They have merely brought sorrow to their stockholders.

In particular, there is one great and conspicuous corporation that set out years ago to succeed in business, and managed its concerns with such energy and sagacity as to make its methods a model for its rivals and neighbors, and its name the very synonym for success in trade. The man who managed it showed a genius for business. The associates whom he chose were almost without exception able, self-controlled, decent-living men; astute

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adventurers and tireless workers. The leader was indomitable and insatiate. No degree of success in the field he had chosen satisfied him so long as any further degree was imaginably possible. No measure of commercial success that had ever before been set served as the limit to his aspirations. He aimed to get all there was in the business without concern whether there would be anything left in it for anybody else, or for what anybody before him had been satisfied to get out of any business. An ambitious person, certainly. His methods need not here be discussed,—whether they were lawful according to the laws of their time, whether they were moral according to the business standards of their day, whether they were unwarrantably ruthless. There was no question of their effectiveness, for by them he succeeded in his aims to a degree unmatched in familiar history. He enriched himself preposterously, enriched also every one who cast his lot in with him and left it there, and made the corporation of which his spirit was the soul the most remarkable—perhaps the greatest—business concern in the world.

Get away now from the personality of this man of commercial genius and consider merely his corporation. Did it succeed too much? There are, no doubt, gospel and philosophical reasons for saying that it did, but pass them by as inapplicable to a corporation. There is no certain indication of over-success in the mere possession by its shareholders of embarrassing riches. There may be such a thing as too much money, and some of them may suffer from it, but all that is hopelessly debatable. The corporation money may not be worth to some of its possessors all that it has cost; less at less cost might, and probably would, have left some of them in a better case to pursue happiness, but that, too, is too large and vague a field to wander in. It seems more to the point to suggest that when the corporation succeeded so much as to disturb the balance of things, and imperil the stability of that attitude of the public mind on which its own permanent prosperity as a corporation depended, it crossed the safety line. This happened when it had succeeded so profusely, and left so many crushed and yelling competitors squirming in its wake, as to force it upon the attention of the more thoughtful of the half-admiring, half-deprecating spectators that like success procured by like methods by a few score of other corporations in other lines of business would leave the population of the United States in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bondage to monopolies. Then the spectators began to suspect that it had succeeded to a degree that threatened the commercial, and indirectly the political, liberties of the people, and in that suspicion there were the seeds of discomfort for that corporation. It seems then a purely secular and material opinion that when its success had made (or seemed to make) compulsory its own restriction, the prohibition for the future of some of the methods it had grown by, and the curbing of its imitators, it had gone somewhat too far. It had achieved a prodigious, a monstrous, success in life, but, even for a corporation, a dangerously imperfect success in living.

Take another case.

It is admitted that a lively interest in athletics is very good for the young men in the colleges, and that it is important that it should be as widely diffused among them as possible. It is good for them to play together; good for them physically, socially and morally, and the good of it is recognized in all the more favorably situated colleges by ample, and often costly, provision of boat-houses, and broad fields for football, baseball and all the other out-door sports. Almost every college president would be glad to have every one of his young men devote a part of every working day to some lively out-of-door sport. The open-air exercise is good for them, and the democratic influences of games and physical contests is excellent. And as competition is the life of trade, so from the first it has been recognized as the life of college sport; so that the contests between the colleges that began in this country—more than half a century ago—with a boat-race between Yale and Harvard, came about naturally, and have extended to practically all the colleges, and to nearly all the sports in which undergraduates engage. But the colleges have rapidly increased in numbers, and have kept growing bigger and bigger, and the contests between them have multiplied and every year gained in importance, and interested more and more spectators, until conservative observers now complain that these competitions have lost their original and true function of encouraging undergraduates to take wholesome exercise and have wholesome fun, and tend rather to confine the active participation in athletics to a comparatively small body of undergraduate specialists who excel in them, and who are con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strained to devote to them a good deal more time and energy than they can spare. This seems to be particularly true of football, which, though a valuable field sport in a great number of schools, public and private, all over the country, seems in the colleges to have become chiefly valuable as a means of advertisement.

Let us try to see what has happened to intercollegiate athletics to make such allegations as this seem reasonable.

There is a maxim to the effect that a thing that is worth doing at all is worth doing as well as you can. It is as handsome and engaging a maxim as there is in the book, and has the complexion of self-evident truth all over it. Nevertheless, it isn't so. There is a large abundance of things worth doing and necessary to do, and for each individual there are only a select few things that are worth doing as well as he can. The rest are only worth doing as well as he can afford to do them,—as well as he can do them in the time, and with the strength, that more important concerns permit him to spare to them. The trouble with intercollegiate athletics, and especially with football, about which there is the most complaint, has been this mistaken over-urgency of nearly all the colleges to do them as well as they possibly could, regardless of the claims of matters more important.

Take, for example, a college of notable distinction in sports, which has not been content to be in intercollegiate athletics merely for her health and incidental glory, but has thought it very important to be pre-eminent, and to that end has put her mind to excellent purpose in the work of organizing victory. Feeling that whatever she did was worth doing as well as she could, she has done her very best in athletics, and with magnificent results so far as winning goes. Not much sound complaint can be made about her methods—which are admirably effective—except perhaps this general one—if even this is sound —that she has, perhaps, been willing to pay more for success in athletics than it was worth, and has constrained the colleges that competed with her to pay, if they could, the same price that she did, under penalty of being beaten nine-tenths of the time.

I don't know that any of her competitors except one has ever shown any special reluctance to pay anything possible for athletic success, but one of them in a half-hearted way has hung back with some obstinacy from paying the price of victory. This one has not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wanted professional coaches, nor unduly protracted periods of preparation. She has wanted to take sport a little easier, spread it out a little thinner and wider, keep it on a lower level of execution more compatible with other interests, and try to get more fun out of it and more out-door exercise for more people. She has tried to get her chief competitor to see sport in the light that she did, and play with her on easier terms, but has not been able to get her preferences in these particulars respected. For the rival has gone straight on, getting better and better instruction for her oarsmen and football players, hiring such coaches or trainers as she needed to hire and drafting those worth drafting, and making the avocation of the university athlete more and more important and exacting and less and less reconcilable to the due development of his vocation as a student and the rounding out of his human nature. Of course in all the colleges the athletic avocation tends, among the leading athletes, to overtop and overshadow their vocation as students. No one college is to blame for that, but every college is to blame, in proportion as its influence in athletic matters has been potent and far-reaching, which has steadily made it harder to keep intercollegiate sport in its proper place. It sounds like flubdub to say that if this or that college, in her athletic methods, had been somewhat more slack, it would have been better for her and for all the colleges that compete with her. Maybe it is flubdub. Yet something like that must be the complaint if there is to be a complaint. The victories of the leaders in the current intercollegiate contests are won by the brains of graduates and hired men, and by the same means must be won any victories that are won by colleges that compete with them. Unaided, or slightly aided, undergraduates cannot win in the greater intercollegiate competitions of the present day. A football team, or a crew that is to compete on equal terms with the leading teams and crews, must have the longest and most exacting training compatible with the necessary minimum of college work and the uncontrollable idiosyncrasies of the North American climate, and must be directed in it by masters of such work, who give to it all the time that can be advantageously employed in it, let their other duties be what they may. If intercollegiate contests on these terms cost too much; if the strain of them is unwholesomely great on everybody concerned in them; if the damage they do to scholarship and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental and social side of education is not offset by the good they do to the moral and physical side of it; if, finally, they exact too great a sacrifice of time and energy from the students who take the leading part in them and who in some cases are virtually compelled to take it, then we may perhaps be warranted in feeling that intercollegiate athletics is suffering from some redundancy of success.

Take another case.

If a politician cannot achieve popularity he might as well go out of business. His power, for good or bad, depends upon his ability to win the liking and the confidence of the voters. If the voters don't know him, don't like him, and don't prefer him to somebody else, he cannot, in this country, go far on the road towards political preferment. If he aspires to high place, extended power, and great opportunities for public service or the gratification of his desires, he must make himself known to multitudes of people, and make them like him. That is the rule for all politicians, good or bad; for Lincoln or for Tweed; for Roosevelt or for Ruef. They are all aspirants for public favor, and they cannot do much unless they get it.

No American in recent times, if ever, has won the public favor to the extent that an eminent contemporary statesman had won it two years ago. No American in office was ever so popular as he was then. How did he do it? Undoubtedly he made a business of it, but it was a business for which he was remarkably qualified, and to which he applied himself with astonishing energy. His greatest single qualification for the job of making people like him was his great ability to like them. He is a very warm-hearted man, with the instinct to please, an enthusiasm for generous and noble ideals, and an extremely active, interesting mind with which to work upon the minds of others. His sympathies are very ready, and he has an unquestionable zeal to do the public the greatest service he can and put to rights everything that needs it. His method of practising the popular arts was, chiefly, to let himself out and behave according to his natural impulses. There was plenty of press-agent and bill-board work about his remarkable military career, but it was voluntary work, contributed *gratis* by the newspaper correspondents and bill-stickers, rejoicing to push along a good thing. Of course,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in certain particulars the luck went marvellously his way, but when Fortune's favors dropped in his arms, he never fumbled them, but dealt with them according to the impulses of his heart and the admonitions of his wits. The result was the accumulation of an all but boundless popularity, based very largely on sound reasons, and remarkably solid and durable, considering the rapidity of its growth. The trouble with it has been, not that it was too great to last, for it has lasted surprisingly, but that the enormous influence that it brought him, joined to the authority of office, gave him more power than he could handle wisely, and deprived him of checks that should have limited its use. Public opinion can restrain any officer of government, but it has been until recently of very little use as a brake to this one because he has controlled it, his popularity being so overwhelming as to make even reasonable opposition and reasonable criticism disastrously unsafe for members of his own party, and futile in any one else.

Besides that, popularity is a thing with a vast appetite that demands constant feeding. It is an instinct with most of us human creatures to hold what we have got, and try to add to it. We like to keep on rolling our snowballs, and we look to see where there is the most snow. There is a popular and disgusting maxim—disgusting because there is so much truth in it—that there is no such thing in affairs as standing still, and that when we cease to gain we begin to lose. It is that, in great measure, that keeps a great money-maker continually on the reach after more gains long after he has got enough; that that makes a college that has established the habit of winning in athletics look upon defeat as an unbearable calamity; that that makes a statesman contrive policies and press measures to hold his following. A general is bound to feed his army till he finishes the campaign. This statesman we have in mind, to fulfil his aims, had to feed his popularity, and fed it finally so many burning words and urgent purposes and autocratic actions that a very respectable and conservative element in the population came to be afraid of him, and to be solicitous that when his strenuous hands let go of the Republican sceptre it should pass to some milder man without so much reputation to maintain. It seems arguable, therefore, that he succeeded more than was profitable in the work of gaining popularity, since he got so much that it strained his resources

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to feed it, and made thoughtful and friendly observers fear the consequences of its continuing to be fed. And it blinded him a little, too, making him feel that he must be right in almost everything he did, because the people were with him in such overwhelming majority. But they were with him, not because everything he did was wise, but because they believed in him and trusted in his character. For the people are pretty sound judges of character, but in their estimate of the wisdom of measures and the expediency of means they are a very untrustworthy guide.

Happily for him, and for his fame, and for the country, he had the remarkable sagacity to put an absolute limit, by a timely declaration, to his servitude to his own popularity. His notice given, in good season and in convincing form, of his purpose not to be again a candidate for the office he holds, was notice of a clear and final determination not to sacrifice the gains and the hopes of a remarkable success in living to any glamour of a possibly unprecedented success in life.

Too much success is that which is gained by the sacrifice of something worth more than itself. The great objection to it, outside of its own undesirableness, is that it disturbs the balance of things. It is unstable, impermanent, the exploit of imperfectly civilized people, carrying in itself the seeds of its own dissolution. If we are wise we shall not wish to tie up to it, nor to see our children allied with its exponents. Examples of it abound in history and in contemporary life. The Slave Power succeeded too much; the Tariff has succeeded too much; the San Francisco Labor Unions have lately done the same. Instances are very common of men who succeed too much in business or in speculation, lose their sagacity of judgment and come to crashing discomfiture. For all considerable success is a trial of character, and has its danger-point where the job begins to want to own the man.

The great, effectual remedy for dangers of that sort is the practice of the golden rule, and the resolute shifting of one's labors from self-aggrandizement and selfish accumulation, to the service of society. The men who have it in them to succeed too much are the ones whose labors it is most important to divert betimes from private concerns to the huge task of keeping order and prosperity in the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is it a propensity that is peculiarly American, I wonder—this propensity to succeed too much? The examples of it that have been submitted above are typical American examples. Is it something in the air we breathe here that partially disqualifies some of our natural winners from knowing when they have won enough? Is it that our society is so restless and so rapacious that profitable living in it is too hard to achieve, and we are constrained to find such a substitute as we can for it in the headlong pursuit of success in life? Do our wheels turn too fast and wear us out with half futile revolutions? Sometimes it seems so. Certainly it seems true,—true for individuals and still more conspicuously and incontestably true for a people,—that success in life is mainly valuable as it leads to, or makes possible, success in living.

EDWARD S. MARTIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT QUEBEC HAS MEANT TO THE UNITED STATES.

BY H. ADDINGTON BRUCE.

THREE hundred years ago this month, the foundations of Quebec were laid by Samuel de Champlain. Our neighbors to the north, properly appreciative of the notable part played in their history by the rugged rock city, are preparing to celebrate its tercentenary with twentieth-century pomp and magnificence. For nearly a fortnight there will be a succession of splendid pageants illustrating every phase in the city's development. The picturesque scenes connected with the coming of its founder, so graphically described by Champlain himself, will be re-enacted. The historic Plains of Abraham will once more ring with the tread of an armed host. Before onlooking thousands there will sweep a mighty fleet, dwarfing by its grizzly strength the craft that of yore gave battle on the waters of the lordly St. Lawrence. Living links with the wonderful past will be supplied by the presence of representatives of families tracing their descent back to the makers of Quebec—and to its conquerors. Frenchmen and Englishmen will fraternize on the spot where their ancestors fought and died, and both will be made royally welcome by the enthusiastic Canadians.

Americans will be there, too, and they should be there in goodly numbers; nor in the rôle of mere spectators. As a historical heritage, Quebec is theirs fully as much as it belongs to the people of Canada. It has exercised no less powerful an influence on their destinies than on the destinies of the Canadians. In fact, remote as the connection may seem, Quebec is well entitled to rank with Jamestown and Plymouth as a primal fountain of American liberty. In one way and another, almost from its beginning, it was a foremost factor in developing the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ideals that culminated in the Declaration of Independence. Not that it was a centre from which radiated sentiments of democracy and liberality. On the contrary, even in its days of infancy as a wilderness trading-post, it was a citadel of absolutism. And, as time passed, its absolutist characteristics became accentuated, until, on the eve of the conquest, they reached intolerable heights in the régime of the bureaucratic Vaudreuil and the infamous Bigot. Nevertheless, Quebec remained a vital force in stimulating and assisting the American people along the path of freedom.

In this respect its influence was felt, first of all and most of all, through what historians have termed the "hinterland movement." Sharply contrasting purposes animated the men from England and the men from France who, in the far-off years of early colonization, voyaged across the stormy Atlantic to take possession of the New World. The English came to America chiefly to win homes for themselves in a country where they would be free from the social, political and religious disabilities under which they had labored in their native land.* The French were inspired hardly at all by the home-building spirit. Desire to amass wealth, love of adventure and missionary zeal were their great motives. Consequently, while the English were content to establish themselves in compact settlements along the coast, the ardent French ranged far inland, making friends of the Indians, trafficking with them, Christianizing them. Champlain himself had little more than built his "habitation" at Quebec before he was up and off on the explorations that have contributed so greatly to his fame. Trader, adventurer and priest followed him, pressing steadily and rapidly towards the land of the setting sun. Within a decade of the founding of Quebec, a Recollet friar was laboring among the Lake Huron savages. Only a few years more, and the daring young Norman, Nicolet, was canoeing through Wisconsin's network of streams. A little later, and the black-gowned Jesuits were planting the Cross among the Indians of Sault Ste. Marie.

All this time the English colonists had made next to no progress, so far as westward expansion was concerned. By 1660, or twenty years after the Jesuits reached the Sault, the English "farthest west" was but a few beggarly miles from the coast, in

* This, of course, does not apply to the first English settlement, as the wealth motive predominated in the colonization of Virginia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the upper valley of the Connecticut. In one important respect, however, the dwellers by the sea had far surpassed the pioneers of France, as the authorities in Quebec saw with undisguised alarm. In all Canada, including Acadia, the white population barely exceeded three thousand souls; in New England alone it was more than eighty thousand. Clearly, if the English continued to increase in this proportion, they would soon overflow into territory claimed by France. Already, indeed, there had been an armed invasion of Acadia by yeoman soldiery from New England. Something must be done to retard their development and at the same time strengthen French pretensions to New World dominion. Louis XIV, the most ambitious monarch who ever sat on the throne of France, lost little time in grappling with the problem once the control of French affairs passed into his powerful keeping. Troops and colonists were sent out, the trading company which had hitherto mismanaged the interests of New France was dissolved, and the colony was elevated to the status of a royal province. What was most important, King Louis found in Talon, Frontenac and La Salle a trio of servants zealous to advance the power and prestige of France.

With their advent a new and vigorous impetus was given to the hinterland movement, which for the first time became a definite part of French policy in America. It involved nothing less than the exploration and occupation of the vast Mississippi Valley, and the creation of a chain of forts and trading-posts designed to connect the mouth of the Mississippi with the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and to oppose an effectual barrier to the English did they attempt to cross the Alleghanies. The first steps in this gigantic programme were carried out by the building of Fort Frontenac in 1673; and, in the same year, by the epoch-marking voyage of Marquette and Joliet down the Mississippi. Thereafter, the advance of the French into the great valley progressed apace with the spectacular achievements of La Salle, Tonti, Iberville and Bienville. At the same time, as a means of masking their operations in the interior, and also for the purpose of weakening the English, the rulers of New France embarked on a policy of forceful aggression, enlisting the services of Indian allies for a series of devastating border raids.

Out of this grew the memorable Seventy Years War, usually subdivided by American historians into King William's War,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Queen Anne's War, King George's War, and the French and Indian War. Except in its final stages, it was a conflict in which the English colonists were virtually left to fight their battles unaided by the Mother Country. Had this aid been given in anything like adequate degree, or had the colonies presented a united front, the war would speedily have come to an end. But such were the jealousies prevailing between colony and colony, union was quite out of the question, and the brunt of the fighting fell on the colonies most exposed to French attack. Even so, the merchants and farmers who rallied to the defence were not slow to meditate reprisals, and to plan conquest on their own account. They saw clearly that the seat of French power in America was Quebec; that Quebec furnished the base of operations for both red foe and white; and that until Quebec fell they could not hope for a lasting peace. As early as 1690—acting, it has been claimed, on the suggestion of Peter Schuyler, the first Mayor of Albany—a colonial Congress decided on a plan of campaign which had for objective the capture of Quebec and the conquest of New France. This attempt failed, as did several similar "glorious enterprises" launched during the next few years, and the advantage rested wholly with the French until Nicholson and Vetch conquered Acadia in 1710.

Meantime, the hinterland movement continued unceasingly, to the growing alarm of the British colonists, who began to appreciate in good earnest the menace it constituted to their future development. Their uneasiness was shared by many colonial officials, notably the Governor of Virginia, which colony laid claim to a vast extent of territory between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi. But no representations could move the home authorities to action. Walpole's "era of good feeling" had set in, and not the slightest desire was felt to endanger the peaceful relations between England and France by a dispute over the possession of the mid-American wilderness. This attitude of selfish indifference and neglect was not lost on the colonists, already incensed at the greater favor shown the settlers of the English West Indies, whose interests had been promoted in every way possible. They did not waste breath, however, in vain reproaches; nor did they supinely allow the French to overrun them. Instead, they began a hinterland movement of their own, intended to cripple their adversaries by diverting from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Montreal and Quebec the rich fur trade of the interior, and to pave the way for trans-Alleghany settlement. And, keeping their eyes fixed steadfastly on Quebec as the source of all their woes, they awaited only a favorable opportunity to deal a crushing blow.

Their chance came with the War of the Austrian Succession, which saw England and France at odds once more. Aided by an English fleet, and led by a New England business man, four thousand colonial volunteers fought their way into the Cape Breton fortress of Louisburg, long accounted impregnable. "On to Quebec!" was then their cry, and from distant England thundered an echoing, "On to Quebec!" It seemed impossible for the Government to withstand the enthusiasm called forth by this valiant deed overseas. And, in fact, though only after painful deliberation, orders were sent to Governor Shirley of Massachusetts, a veteran advocate of conquest, to raise an army for the invasion of New France, aid being promised in the form of an English squadron and a strong force of English regulars. The colonial troops were soon in waiting, but the promised assistance did not come. The Government, to tell the truth, was divided against itself, one faction wishing to end the war with France by obtaining peace at any price. More than this, after "Bonnie Prince Charlie's" futile attempt to regain the crown for the Stuarts, objections were raised on the ground that England needed her troops at home to repel a possible French invasion. In the end, notwithstanding the angry protests of ministers like the Duke of Bedford and the Duke of Newcastle,* not only were the colonists again left to shift for themselves, but by the terms of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, signed in 1748, Louisburg was actually handed back to the French.

As a matter of course, this step was bitterly resented by the colonies and particularly by New England, the section which alone had sent its sons to the conquest of the Cape Breton stronghold. Reviewing the policy of the English Government since first the rulers of New France let loose the dogs of war from their kennel at Quebec, the colonists wrathfully told one another

* The statesmanship of Bedford and Newcastle has been quite generally underrated. A careful study of source material leads to the conclusion that Pitt gleaned from them, in large measure, the ideas which ultimately found expression in the new imperial policy of England, so successfully executed by the great war minister.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Mother Country cared not a whit for their welfare, that their difficulties and sufferings mattered nothing to her. Nor can it be safely argued that they were far wrong. But the time was drawing near when England, for her own sake if not for love of the colonies, would be forced to act in their behalf. Statesmen were beginning to realize that that great intangible principle known as the "balance of power," so long the motive force of international comity and international complications, had gradually shifted from Europe to America. Within a twelvemonth after Aix-la-Chapelle, official sanction was given to the colonial hinterland movement by granting to the recently organized Ohio Land Company a large tract of territory west of the Alleghanies. A little later, hearing that the French were secretly sending troops to Quebec and were striving to hamper English colonization in Acadia, the Duke of Newcastle drew up a furious memorial which would have meant war had not his peace-loving brother, Pelham, persuaded him to modify it. "If we lose our American possessions," he bluntly told Pelham, "or the influence and weight of them in time of peace, France will with great ease make war with us whenever she pleases hereafter." This unmistakably sounded a new note in English colonial statesmanship, as did the instructions sent to the colonial Governors in 1753 authorizing them to repel by force, if necessary, any invasion of English territory. Less than a year from the receipt of these instructions, Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia hurried young George Washington into the western wilds to fire the shot which announced to the world that the Seventy Years War had entered on its last stage.

No need to retell here the familiar story of the titanic struggle which ended only with the fall of Quebec, the conquest of New France and the annihilation of French sovereignty in America. The important point to us is to note its significance to the English colonists, and the part they played in it. As had always been the case, the colonies most remote from the theatre of conflict showed only a half-hearted interest. Even those prompt to contribute money and men were at first sorely discouraged by the disasters brought about through the inefficiency of the commanders sent to them before the masterful genius of William Pitt dominated the war policy. And the ardor of the volunteers was further chilled, and their proper pride injured, by the open con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempt in which the regulars held them. Wolfe's splenetic outburst—when he denounced the colonial militia as "the dirtiest, most contemptible, cowardly dogs, rather an encumbrance than any real strength to an army"—testified eloquently to the unreasoning, insolent prejudices entertained by the English soldiery in general. This, too, of men who, like their fathers and grandfathers before them, were fighting and dying in a cause that meant much to England, however signally England had failed to appreciate it.

But they could afford to disregard sneers and insults. They were battling in defence of their homes, and to them must be given a large share of credit for the triumph ultimately achieved. A careful historian, not an American, has estimated that, despite their lack of unity and harmony, the colonies put into the field more troops than were contributed by the Mother Country. It is true that they had scarcely any hand in the spectacular victories at Louisburg and Quebec, but they were pre-eminent in the inland campaigns essential to the complete subjugation of New France. Of the seven thousand men who marched with Forbes to the reduction of Fort Duquesne, five thousand were volunteers from Pennsylvania and Virginia. Bradstreet's contingent that mastered the ancient Fort Frontenac was recruited mostly from New England and New York. Colonials were the conquerors of Fort Niagara, the gateway to the Ohio Valley, and colonials made up almost half the army with which Amherst forced the surrender of the city of Montreal. Upon colonials, again, fell the heavy burden of defending the southern and southwestern frontiers against the attacks of the Indian allies of the French. It was thus that Washington got the military training which availed him so well a few years afterwards—and as with Washington, so with many others who were to win enduring fame in the heroic War of the Revolution.

Military training, however, was only one of the minor benefits accruing to the colonists from their seventy years of effort to win Quebec and thereby rid themselves of the French incubus. The long-continued struggle had developed in them to a conspicuous degree the spirit of self-reliance and self-confidence. It had helped them to appreciate their innate strength, and had conjoined with the influence of their wilderness environment to foster the qualities of alertness and resourcefulness. Over and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above all this, it had brought them far, however unconsciously, on the road to independence, by opening their eyes to the deep-rooted selfishness of the Mother Country. If further enlightenment were needed, it was furnished with the beginning of peace negotiations.

France had been utterly crushed by sea and by land, yet England could not possibly hope to reap the full fruits of victory. The most belligerent of English statesmen recognized the necessity of making concessions, as otherwise the Continental nations would rally about France, seeing in England no longer the champion of the "balance of power" but its arch-enemy and a deadly menace to the liberties of Europe. Spain's action in rushing to the assistance of France, even after France's cause had been lost, was a sufficient indication of what would happen did England insist on retaining all her conquests. Something must be surrendered, and, utterly oblivious to the interests of the American colonies, it was seriously proposed to surrender Canada and keep instead Guadeloupe, Marie Galante, and the other islands of the French West Indies which had been captured during the war. The debate that ensued was most mortifying and irritating to the colonists. There were few, outside of their agents, who insisted that their rights and desires should be consulted. On the contrary, the debaters on both sides argued as though the sole question were whether the retention of Canada or the retention of the West Indian Islands would be more profitable to England. It was, at bottom, a contest between the manufacturing and the wool-growing interests on the one hand, and the trading interests on the other, and Canada carried the day over the West Indies because the manufacturers and wool-growers proved too strong for the traders.

A popular argument with those who favored the return of Canada to France was the alleged fact that, if Canada were retained, the American colonists, being freed from the French pressure, would at once aspire to independence. This was denied, with the significant addendum that the colonies were too disunited to make an effective bid for freedom, and could not successfully defend their extended coast-line against the power of England.* Now, "suggestion," as we are daily becoming

* It is not without interest to note the other arguments advanced on both sides, as found in the pamphlet literature of the period. Those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more aware, is a potent force in determining the course of human events, and it may well be that the arguments advanced in the Canada-Guadeloupe controversy were influential in bringing the ideal of independence concretely before the eyes of the colonists. That controversy certainly could not heighten their love for England, whether or no they were even then consciously wavering in their allegiance. And, after all they had endured and the lessons they had learned in the Seventy Years War, it is not surprising that they openly voiced their discontent and made ready for stubborn resistance when England, immediately upon the conclusion of peace, abandoned her old-time policy of neglect in favor of a policy of active and obnoxious interference in their affairs.

As every one knows, discontent was succeeded by revolution, and once more the colonists found their fortunes powerfully affected by old Quebec. In the early spring of 1775, when it was realized that war could not longer be averted, they determined to invite the inhabitants of Canada to unite with them in the impending struggle to throw off the English yoke. But, notwithstanding the intrigues of local agitators, like Thomas Walker, of Montreal, and the impassioned pleas of emissaries from the American colonies, Canada remained loyal. Only the year before, the English Parliament had passed an act guaranteeing to the French-Canadians the free exercise of their religion, and they consequently had no ardent desire to join their fortune

who favored the retention of the conquered islands in the West Indies contended: (1) that the islands were economically far more valuable than Canada; (2) that their retention would deal a heavy blow to France's naval strength, as the possession of the sugar islands gave her special inducements to develop shipping and seamen; (3) that if Canada were kept there would be a heavy emigration from England, thus weakening the Mother Country; (4) that the retention of Canada would lead the American colonists to develop manufactures of their own; (5) that Canada *plus* the American colonies would form too extensive a dominion to be governed properly from a distance. To these arguments it was replied: (1) that there was no immediate need for further sugar-growing territory, whereas Canada was really needed to supply raw materials not otherwise available in England; (2) that France's naval greatness rested, not on the sugar islands, but on the Canadian fisheries; (3) that the retention of the islands, rather than the retention of Canada, would cause a heavy emigration from England, as the islands were so damp and unhealthy that they would constantly require repopulation; (4) that the American colonists would not develop manufactures, but would remain agriculturists, because of the vast extent of fertile land at their disposal; (5) that the difficulties of government would not be increased.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with those of a people who had explicitly denounced that act, and had uniformly shown themselves hostile to Roman Catholicism and Roman Catholics. The English-Canadians, of course, were differently situated, but they were in a feeble minority and, no matter how discontented they might be, were powerless so long as the French-Canadians held firm. And, still further to defeat the American overtures, there was in the palace of Quebec an English Governor, Sir Guy Carleton, able and willing to quell disaffection with an iron hand.

Friendly efforts coming to naught, a campaign of conquest was undertaken with the celebrated Arnold-Montgomery expedition. This is usually described as a gigantic failure, and failure it was in the sense that it ended in the complete repulse of the invading armies. Yet it was also of tremendous profit to the American cause. When Benedict Arnold, after the heart-breaking march through the Maine forests, was beaten back from Quebec's grim walls, he did not at once give over an attempt that had cost the brave Montgomery his life. Instead, he patiently laid siege to the city, holding it in close investment until the arrival of English reinforcements with the opening of navigation in 1776. Then, compelled to withdraw, he contested Carleton's vengeful pursuit with such desperate valor as to disrupt the carefully studied plan by which the English hoped to master the Hudson Valley, hem in New York and New England, and crush the Revolution in its incipiency. It is perhaps, then, no exaggeration to say that the manner in which Arnold conducted his retreat from Quebec was the saving of his country. So that, failure though the invasion was, it forms another and not the least impressive chapter in the story of Quebec's contribution to the making of the United States.

H. ADDINGTON BRUCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ONE WAY OF GOVERNING MALAYS.

BY ELIZABETH WASHBURN WRIGHT.

THE Federated Malay States represent as complete a bit of executive mechanism as Great Britain or any nation may to-day boast of. There are four of them—Perak, Pahang, Selangor and Negri Sembilan. They are touched in the north by four much-disputed states partially protected by Siam, and reach in the south to Johore and Singapore, which is the southernmost point of the Asiatic continent and misses the equator by a hair's breadth.

Johore is the one and only Malay state governed by its native head. It is, however, protected by Great Britain and submits its external policy to British supervision. Otherwise it holds an unique position of independence in the Peninsula. Singapore is on a tiny island separated from Johore and the mainland by a narrow strait.

On one side of the Peninsula stretch the Straits of Malacca, and on the other is the big wash of the China Sea. Malay, therefore, lies half-way between Ceylon and Hong-Kong, and within easy reach of that fragrant bunch of islands, Sumatra, Java, Borneo and the lesser islets of the Archipelago.

Singapore was bought as a personal venture by Stamford Raffles in 1819, and it is to-day the coaling-station and calling-port of all the traffic that rides on Eastern seas. It is as well a formidable stronghold in case of war. Besides this, it is the chief and executive centre of the detached British colonies that dot the Straits of Malacca. There are five of these—a united Crown Colony, once forming an Indian Presidency, but at present owing allegiance to their Governor in Singapore and to the Colonial Secretary in London.

North of Singapore and nearest it in point of distance is Malacca, a quaint and historic town which has passed through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a picturesque and varied occupancy. Originally seized by the Portuguese in 1511, it was taken from them by the Dutch some hundred years later. This was followed in the next century by a temporary settlement by the English, who surrendered it again to Holland in 1808. Five years later, it passed finally into the keeping of Great Britain, who gave the Dutch in exchange the valuable and then unexplored island of Sumatra.

Two hundred miles farther up the coast lies a cluster of beautiful but practically uninhabited islands called the Dindings. These islands were the last acquisition of the Straits Settlements, having been taken in 1873 by the government in Singapore on the outbreak of the Malay disturbances.

The next of these colonies, the farthest north, is the island and town of Penang, or properly speaking Georgetown. This territory was bought and settled in the latter part of the eighteenth century in the interest of the East India Company. On the mainland directly opposite Penang is Wellesley Province, a narrow tract of rice-fields bordering the Straits. Here the so-called and badly called Straits Settlements end; Singapore, Malacca, Dindings, Penang and Wellesley Province—five pearls, as it were, on a broken string.

Practically all the steps leading to the acquirement of these detached territories were due to the personal energy and initiative of a few individuals, without the sanction or knowledge of the country for whose aggrandizement the work was being done. But common interests and common enemies gradually drew the little settlements together and brought them to the notice of Great Britain, who promptly amalgamated them and took them under her wing.

Their growth and government are well worthy of study. But in this paper I can only touch on their institutions as related to the government of the Malay States. This connection lies in the fact that the Governor of the Straits Settlements is also High Commissioner for the Protected Malay States. In this capacity, he has a voice in their external policy and in all matters not strictly confined within the jurisdiction of their Resident General. He likewise has power to reject or modify papers before submitting them to the Colonial Secretary, whose potter's thumb must give the final imprint to all clay from colonial kilns.

Here we cease finally with the marginal influences of the Malay

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, and now for the States themselves. Thirty-odd years ago they were disorderly, disorganized provinces under the rule, or misrule, of native rajahs or chiefs. These Malays were fishermen, hunters, pirates and despoilers of one another's peace and provinces. They carried their differences up and down their long rivers or confined them with slaughterous results within their tiny kampongs or villages. Again, banding together, they attacked unwary craft that ventured too near their shores.

They were in fierce and constant friction with the Chinese, who, led by the rumors of rich minerals in the Peninsula, had broken into their stronghold. Knowledge of the ferocity of these encounters, and of the general state of distraction existing amongst the Malays themselves, occasionally drifted to the outside world. These rumors had from time immemorial frightened away all would-be invaders. The undesirability of ' cing a more accurate acquaintanceship was further discouraged by the British authorities in Singapore, who warned all subjects that they ventured into the unknown territory at their own risk.

This enforced seclusion gave unlimited swing to the Malays, and kept intact till the time of British interference an almost prehistoric and brutal condition of life. The long-delayed intervention took place in 1873, when the internal distraction in the native territory reached its limits and burst into open rupture on the seacoast. The Chinese were preying on the Malays, and the Malays to the best of their ability were retaliating. The native sultans were at loggerheads with one another, and totally unable to control or direct their turbulent and disorderly subjects.

This warfare was carried to the coast, and there it became an open menace to commerce and to all traffic passing through the Straits. Then at last, in self-defence, the Government in Singapore was told to interfere. The result was the appearance of a British man-of-war in the tumultuous waters, and, after a violent collision and some loss of life, steps were taken toward the conclusion of a treaty and overtures were made for a better understanding. This ended in the British occupation of the Dindings, the chief rendezvous of these lawless folk. Here Great Britain was able to check and finally abolish their dangerous practices.

Negotiations were opened at the same time with various native

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chiefs. Finally, at the invitation of the Sultan of Perak, who was tired of the internal turmoil, a quasi-administrative, quasi-commercial officer was established in that state, with the somewhat ambiguous title of Resident.

There follows a perplexing, unpleasant page of history. Confusing mists fortunately surround the actual facts. But to Great Britain the reading was plain enough. Her official representative had been brutally murdered and that death was to be avenged. And it was. Reparation was demanded and grudgingly granted. The circumstance sealed the fate of the Malays. Great Britain was behind her cannon, and there she was to remain.

The curious and venturesome who had long desired to explore the forbidden provinces now pushed forward, and the gate has never since been closed. They came as the flotsam and jetsam of restless life that washes from one pole to the other, as individuals and in groups, as fortune-hunters drawn by the persistent rumors of gold and as the law-breaker seeking shelter. As young, untried men they came, to whom adventure is as the breath of their nostrils and the breaking of virgin soil a delight which through all ages has set young pulses throbbing. Finally, they came in little bands that Government sent out—raw, untried cadets and earnest, energetic men, who were entrusted with a great lump of unmoulded clay and told to set to work. Some were appalled and turned the ball helplessly from hand to hand, knowing no design. Others grew weary with the unwonted weight and threw away the clay. Others again took the raw matter in hand and toiled soberly and unceasingly upon it, and finally traced out a design that thought and keen observation told them was the appropriate one. To-day this pattern stands elaborated in an unique system of government, that calls other men and nations with like work before them to stop and study.

This rough clay, some thirty years ago, lay in an unmapped, unknown, impassable country. The task of moulding it required years of hardship and discouragements, and all the effort that lies between barbarism and the attainment of what the world to-day calls civilization. It meant the drawing of maps, the building of roads, the placing of villages, the tracing of rivers, all the details and equipment that go hand in hand with a modern civilization. It meant, more accurately, an endless, intolerable struggle with a thousand-limbed jungle, that took ten steps to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man's one. It meant fighting one's way foot by foot over the new land, through forest, mire and mangrove swamp. It meant frightful days of exposure in native canoes on steaming, rank rivers that wound and rewound their tortuous courses, and led into native hostile camps. It meant days and weeks and months of loneliness and despair, being scorched by a relentless sun, chilled by sudden drenching rains, threatened by natives, sickened by improper food, weakened by fever, maddened by solitude and disheartened by the daily onslaught of ever-new discouragements. Finally, it meant self-sacrifice and suffering and effacement in behalf of a nation that knew little of the land, and took no heed of the valiant vigilance of her sons to uphold her standards in an unwilling soil.

The time of this struggle seemed to the weary workmen endless in its passage, but to the observer of to-day it appears to have been incredibly swift. In less than twenty years the jungle was forced back and paths cut through it. The rivers were bridged, the mountains scaled and small settlements of Europeans sprang simultaneously into being. A tiny executive was established, and the tortuous process of gaining the confidence of the natives terminated in success.

To-day the task is practically finished, and the Malay States stand a body organized, nominally under rulers calling themselves "sultans"; but the mind and the might are Great Britain's, and the hand at the helm is a white one. It is an unique situation, involving alike the most delicate tact and masterful assertion, for the finished work stands openly not to the credit of Great Britain, but to the credit of the ignorant, indolent sultans, whose native impulse disapproves all progress, yet whose seal makes it not only possible, but compulsory.

For all practical purposes, the States follow the Civil Service code as used in the neighboring colonies, changed where necessary to fit her different needs. They each have their Resident, their District Officers, their Secretariat of English officials and English trained cadets, their magistrates and judicial corps.

Each state has its Surgeon, its District Surgeon, its hospitals and Medical Staff, a Public Works Department, a State Engineer, a Resident Railway Engineer, a Post and Telegraph Department, a Forestry Department and semi-government schools, orphanages and establishments for the destitute. These were the original

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

departments in the various States, or rather the final evolution of the needs of the administration in the separate States.

In 1896 the four States were federated, with their capital in Kwala Lumpor, the chief town of Selangor. Since then has taken place a general movement towards centralization. This departure threatens the sovereignty of the Residents, and tends to merge all power eventually in the hands of the Resident General, who is to-day responsible for the wider policy of the government, and to whom all questions not purely local must be referred.

Federation has also brought about unification in lesser spheres. A federal officer now controls the Public Works Department, and another the railway system throughout the four States. The tendency is for other departments to follow suit, thus simplifying the present laborious system of correspondence, which clogs the wheels of government and prevents speedy action. More essentially, it tends to bring all heads of departments into closer union and sympathy, and makes it possible to carry out a more unified system of government throughout the States. The posts of Judicial Commissioner and Legal Adviser were federal at the time of their establishment, likewise the Commissioner of Police, the Chinese Secretary, and more recently a Department for Medical Research has been established under the guidance of a specialist. The military, or Malay States Guides, is of necessity a federal organization formed of Sikh soldiers and English officers, with a Lieutenant-Colonel at their head.

All the important arteries of administration are officered and controlled by Great Britain; but the so-called and actual executive heads are to be found in the various State Councils, at which the native sultans and their chief headmen sit jointly with the British Resident, with the additional presence in the larger States of a Chinese representative, who watches the interests of the ever-increasing population of his countrymen. At this board, the revenue and expenditure of the State are discussed and new measures of policy decided upon. The exact position of the Resident, and in turn that of the British Government, are here demonstrated. It is nominally that of Adviser, the post of a practically disinterested spectator who proffers advice and suggests adequate measures that will insure its adoption.

To all intents and purposes, it is the sultan only who rules

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and who ordains. The British Resident and his staff of assistant officials are, in the legal writing, but foreign hirelings in the service of the various sultans of Malaya.

The theoretical rôle of these Malay sultans is no mean one, nor would the provinces under their rule take an inferior place beside other civilized communities. But, as a matter of fact, and as is obvious to the most casual observer, the sultan carries but little, if any, weight beyond the outward lettering. He and his chiefs are allowed ostentatious seats at the Councils, and have a voice in petty local government. Here their power ceases, but the local glory attached to these offices seems to suffice, with occasional recognition from Great Britain herself, who has meted out orders and distinctions to these obsolete rulers in ratio according to their intelligent acceptance of the imposed authority.

So the Malay sultan to-day is but the sorry figurehead of a race that never in any way showed itself capable or desirous of bettering its material position or of placing itself morally in a higher status of civilization.

It must be added to the credit of Great Britain that she has shown in every way respect and consideration for these nominal heads, and, where it has been practicable, compliance in furthering their desires. To-day these effete royalties are better housed and salaried, and assured of greater personal peace and security, than was ever their fortune in the palmiest days of their independent reigns.

Whether this unique system of assisting an incompetent people to rule themselves, to literally hold the sceptre in their hands, would with a different race work as satisfactorily, is a difficult thing to say.

This particular system in this particular case has worked to a charm, and has undoubtedly solved many of the problems upon which white men have come to grief in their management of inferior races. This has been largely and obviously due to tact, justice and respect for that fundamental and essential law of treating Orientals from their own point of view, or as near it as the Westerner can safely and honestly approach. It has meant tolerance in religion, leniency in law and, above all things, unfaltering patience in the effort to grasp their childlike and often dense conceptions.

Since the disturbances in Pahang in 1891, the Malay has ceased

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to resist British influences. He has proved a particularly passive model, now that he is actually subdued and conscious of the fact that British rule is working for his good and prosperity. The Malay Peninsula has undoubtedly been his camping-ground for centuries since his exodus from Sumatra, if any one knows when that took place. Here he has fished and fought, obstructed so far as lay in his power the advance of civilization, and reserved for himself and his heirs a broad hunting-ground and battle-field.

But to that civilization which represents the forward march of the crudest folk the Malays have added little. Nor have they left a single definite trace of race imagination or intelligence. There exist to-day no ruins, no relics, no remnants that would show an endeavor to beautify the land or to gratify their imagination by outward expression.

They have no architecture, no literature, no art in its wide significance; little, in fact, to distinguish their habitation of the Peninsula from that of the rudest root-eating aborigines. Yet their personalities would belie this assertion, for they are both proud and sensitive, showing courtesy and consideration if properly treated, and an obvious appreciation of it. Otherwise, they are sullen, silent, indolent, utterly immoral or unmoral, with a lively capacity for intrigue and deception.

At some time of their career Mohammedanism was introduced amongst them by wandering Arabs. This has become deeply interwoven with their native nature-worship and demonology. It is a question if this later phase of religion plays more than a minor part in their lives, Mohammedanism being to them at best but a system of outward forms, which they observe or not, as their moods or natures dictate. Superstitious to a childlike degree, they in their hearts undoubtedly cling to their instinctive belief in magic and malicious demons, and when Mohammedanism fails to solace they return to the elaborate rites and ceremonies that are supposed to propitiate these evil spirits.

With the introduction of Mohammedanism came a written language. So little have they taken advantage of this means of expression, however, or so little have they to express, that their only tribute to literature lies in a handful of fantastic, dully recorded fairy-tales, lacking in humor, in imagination, in style. Yet in verbal legend and folk-lore they are most prolific.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But art itself, the substance and body of spiritual or intellectual expression, they have disregarded or have not been able to approach. Their tribute is the very fringe and finish of a nation's utterance. There seem to have been no beginnings, no early crudities striving to explain themselves, no evolution to an ideal, but simply a detached and finished fragment. Delicate, fanciful woman's work it is, wonderfully fine in form and design, but woefully scant and unsatisfactory in its scope—boxes, bowls, buttons of precious metals cleverly chased, exquisitely chiselled, unique and original in conception and all within the rigid restrictions of Mohammedanism; yet within these narrow lines amazingly rich and resourceful, delicate tracery like lace and simple graceful forms that older, subtler, sounder races may try long in vain to equal or surpass—but it is their all, this, and the weaving of their sarongs, and the smelting of their murderous krises that run swiftly to a man's heart like a flash of crinkled lightning. Here they begin and end—indolent, melancholy, quick to take offence, sure to take revenge.

It may be that the land has overwhelmed them with its own abundant vitality; has overcome, absorbed, swept with a wide hand all trace of man's life from the land. It is a fiercely encroaching, appalling force, beside which the little animation of man becomes an abject thing. Howbeit, there are no men, no things in the Malay Peninsula—only a stupendous, prolific nature, to be feared, and reverenced and worshipped as the spell is upon it. So to-day the Malay sits paralyzed beneath this touch and drowses through the long sun hours, while the Chinaman is up and doing, the Tamil is at his slave work, and all men are helping themselves from the fulness of his land. Content with a tiny patch of paddy, a cluster of cocoanut or plantain trees, he stubbornly resists all offers, all incentives that the Government may urge to stir him into life. Firmly, philosophically he sits upon his stoop calmly chewing betel, while the power of the land is passing irrevocably from his hand.

But the Chinaman is here and here to stay. He tills the soil and digs the tin; draws the rickshaw and runs the shops; opens the opium dens and pays to Government a huge revenue for his gambling farms. He sits at the State Council, is interpreter, is clerk, is innkeeper, is table-boy, is everywhere—industrious, inscrutable, quick to learn, quick to take advantage of his new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge. He is fairly clean, comparatively honest, and in twenty years rises from a coolie digging tin to a towkay handling millions.

The low-caste Tamil follows at a slower pace, does the refuse work of the Peninsula, lays its roads, opens its quarries, works in gangs on coffee estates, performs the menial work of railways and offices. In the towns he plays the rôle of money-lender, rising occasionally to a sphere of some importance.

There is besides a varied host of Sikhs and Bengalis, of Singhalese and Siamese and a smattering of peoples from the neighboring islands of the Archipelago. All these labor in more or less degree towards some end, while the Malay only is fixed in idleness.

To-day this beautiful country of his is open from end to end and sea to sea, ripe and ready for earnest work. Wide roads wind through the forests, whose giant trees hold in their grasp great ferns the size of men. Roots and ropes and mammoth vines dangle earthwards, and clinging to the mighty trunks the jungle orchid bursts into fragrant, fragile bloom.

Up the middle of the Peninsula bristles a range of mountains, and in their high passes the forests tower hundreds of feet above one's head; and before one the hills rise shoulder above shoulder till they vanish in blue mists. On these summits the nights and early mornings are dipped in icy dews, and the breath from the singing jungle is cold and weighted with the fragrance of spices and the heavy perfume of unseen flowers bursting in rank bloom.

The country rolls from beach to valley, and from valley to hill and once more to valley, and so adapts itself alike to the wants of planter and miner. Cocoanut-trees plume and drop their heavy fruit in every village, and groves of plantains flap and flower continuously. Coffee and rubber cover acres of ground, and in the valleys and on the gentle sloping hillsides is a constant ripple of tender green that marks the sprouting rice. In the soft silt of the lowlands, and in blighted barren river-beds, the tin is washed and sifted from the sand. It is this mineral that gives the Government its huge revenue and makes its full coffers the envy of the less wealthy colonies. Tons of tin pour out of the country daily, and are borne to Singapore and Penang for transhipment. There has just been finished a railway line which runs from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Singapore straight through the Peninsula to a port on the sea-coast opposite Penang, and so taps the rich country at every point.

It is unique, this little government; but, strangely enough, it is most inadequately known or appreciated by its home Government. It represents, in its finality, the uncertain, unencouraged, unidentified work of a host, many of whom have sickened and died by the way and laid down their tools, and their names have vanished. But the work remains.

Such is the pathetic fate of the pioneers, the outriders of a nation, who build up their empire like the coral reefs of the Pacific—a pitiful, powerful example of self-renunciation; and of all men to whom praise and justice should be meted out, it is to these willing exiles, who have given up their white man's birthright for a life of solitude and toil. Their failure is often pitiful; their loss of standard and ideal heartrending. But the fact stands that, despite the heaviest obstacles laid across men's paths, work has been accomplished, is being accomplished and a higher grade of civilization raised in this distant quarter of the globe.

It is such work as this that our American Government in the Philippines is doing to-day. Our system is different from that of Great Britain, and the problem before us is a much more difficult one. Though the Filipinos are largely of this same Malay stock, the question has been greatly complicated by the infusion of other races and by a two-centuries' background of Christianity and European influences.

Nevertheless the fundamentals remain the same, for the East is ever the East, and different,—and involves under whatever flag or system the same sympathy and patience and hard work.

It only remains for generous governments to smooth, so far as possible, the paths of these their standard-bearers, and for the individuals who sit at home and point with pride to the tiny checks on the map that bear their colors, to reckon seriously the price of these few inches—the hardships, the sacrifices, the despairs that have gone to swell them.

ELIZABETH WASHBURN WRIGHT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REPEAL OF THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT.

BY T. B. EDGINGTON.

THE Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which took effect on February 18th, 1865, secured to the negro his freedom from slavery. The Fourteenth Amendment, which took effect on July 28th, 1868, among other things, secured to the negro his rights of citizenship, and prohibited any of the States from depriving him of the equal protection of its laws.

The Fifteenth Amendment, which took effect on March 30th, 1870, prohibited the States from denying him the right to vote on account of his color or previous condition of servitude. It reads thus:

"*Section I.* The rights of the citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"*Section II.* Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

When this Amendment was on its passage before Congress, an effort was made to couple with this right to vote the right, also, to hold office; but the phraseology, "the rights of the citizens to vote or hold office," was amended by striking out the words, "or hold office." This left all the States without any constitutional prohibition against the right of a State to enact laws prohibiting the negroes from holding office. There is a popular misapprehension to the contrary.

There is another popular misapprehension to the effect that those who oppose giving suffrage to the negro are in favor of taking away certain rights of citizenship which he possesses. There are two answers to this assumption:

(1) What is called a right to vote is not a right, but a franchise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the Republic was founded, and for many years thereafter, the elective franchise was withheld from a very large class of male citizens over twenty-one years of age. Many of the original thirteen States required the elector to own a freehold estate of a certain value; others, a certain annual income from a freehold; others required the elector to own property of defined worth; one required the payment of taxes assessed, while Connecticut prescribed that the voter should be of quiet and orderly behavior. There was no uniformity among the States then upon the elective franchise; there is no uniformity now. With one or two exceptions among the States, the women are excluded from the privilege of voting; yet it would be improper to say that they are deprived of any of their rights of citizenship. The rights of citizenship and the franchises of sovereignty are very different matters.

(2) The right to vote was not conferred on the negro by the Fifteenth Amendment. It simply prohibited the States from excluding him from the right to vote on account of color or previous condition of servitude. In the case of the United States *vs.* Reese (92 U. S., 217), the Supreme Court of the United States says: "The Fifteenth Amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference, in this particular, to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude." In United States *vs.* Cruikshank (92 U. S., 556), the Supreme Court says: "The right to vote comes from the State, but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States." In this case the Court further says that "the right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship." In the United States *vs.* Williams (193 U. S., 632), the Supreme Court says: "The privilege to vote in any State is not given by the Federal Constitution or by any of its Amendments."

Some of the former Slave States have amended their Constitutions, and it has been found that the Fifteenth Amendment really presents no very serious obstacle to the disfranchisement of the entire negro vote.

The elimination of the negro vote began with the new Constitution of the State of Mississippi in the year 1890. Section 241 of the Constitution provides, among other things, that the voter should be registered, and be able to show that he had paid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all taxes assessed against him for a certain period. This included a two-dollar poll tax. This provision of the Constitution conferred on the Legislature the right to enact laws for the registration of voters. By Section 3,631 of the code, it was provided that no citizen can register as a voter, unless he is able either to read any section of the Constitution of the State, or to understand the same when read to him, and give a reasonable interpretation thereof. This provision, together with the prepayment of taxes required by the Constitution, has left but few negroes in Mississippi who can vote, or who seek to vote.

The State of Louisiana revised its Constitution in the year 1898. Certain educational and property qualifications were enacted. There were exempted from these educational and property qualifications all persons whose fathers were voters in the year 1867 or prior thereto. This latter clause is what is known as the "grandfather clause." This clause practically conferred universal white suffrage. The Constitution of South Carolina was amended in conformity with the Constitution of Mississippi, while North Carolina has adopted the Louisiana plan.

The "grandfather clause" is capable of such extension and improvement, in connection with rigid educational and property qualifications, as to confer universal white suffrage and entirely exclude the negro voters, without violating any of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. A provision could be made in the State Constitution, or law, exempting from the property and educational requirement all naturalized citizens, and all descendants of naturalized citizens, and, indeed, all descendants of European immigrants. As a substitute for registration, a rule of evidence could be provided by law that all white persons are *prima facie* entitled to vote and that all persons of color are *prima facie* not so entitled, leaving to such persons an adequate remedy at law to establish such right.

When the Fifteenth Amendment was on its passage in the Senate, its practical inefficiency was somewhat foreseen by the members, who sought to have the Amendment commit the whole question of suffrage to Congress. This policy was opposed by Charles Sumner, who was against confiding such power to Congress on the ground that it would invade the rights of the States. The Supreme Court, in the cases referred to, held that the States themselves determined who should vote without any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

limitation on their exercises of this right, except that they could not deny the right to vote on the grounds of color or previous condition of servitude. No sooner had these decisions been rendered than it dawned upon the leaders of the Republican party that the Fifteenth Amendment was an unwise and inexpedient measure.

Mr. Blaine* and John Sherman,† and most of the eminent leaders of the Republican party, took this view. Sherman went one step farther than Blaine, and expressed the opinion that the Fifteenth Amendment deprived Congress of the right to enforce that clause of the second section of the Fourteenth Amendment which reduces representation in proportion as the right of suffrage is reduced. His view in substance was that, this clause having been inserted for the exclusive benefit of the negro, and with no purpose that it should have a different application, it was repealed by the enactment of this Fifteenth Amendment substitute. Mr. Sherman said:

"It is a question of grave doubt whether this amendment, though right in principle, was wise or expedient. The declared object was to secure impartial suffrage to the negro race. The practical result has been that the wise provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment have been modified by the Fifteenth Amendment. The latter Amendment has been practically nullified by the action of most of the States where the great body of this race live, and will probably always remain. This is done, not by an express denial to them of the right of suffrage, but by ingenious provisions, which exclude them on the alleged ground of ignorance, while permitting all the white race, however ignorant, to vote at all elections. No way is pointed out by which Congress can enforce this Amendment. If the principle of the Fourteenth Amendment had remained in full force, Congress would have reduced the representation of any State in the proportion in which the number of the male inhabitants of such State, denied the right of suffrage, might bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age, in such State. This simple remedy, easily enforced by Congress, would have secured the right of all persons without distinction of race or color to vote at all elections. The reduction of representation would have deterred every State from excluding the vote of any portion of the male population above twenty-one years of age. As a result of the Fifteenth Amendment, the political power of the States lately in rebellion has been increased, while the population, conferring this increase, is practically denied all political power. I see no remedy for this wrong except the growing intelligence of the negro race, which, in time, I trust, will enable them to demand and receive the right of suffrage."

* Blaine's "Twenty Years of Congress," Vol. 2, page 418.

† Sherman's "Recollections," Vol. 1, page 450.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Supreme Court, in construing a provision of the Constitution of the United States, will always have recourse to the purpose of the provision and the evil it was intended to remedy. The Court will take judicial notice of the events constituting the history of the country, as well as of transactions and objects intimately connected therewith.* The Supreme Court will take judicial notice of the scope and meaning of words and phrases used in the Constitution by a resort to the history of the country.† The Constitution of the United States prohibits any State from issuing "bills of credit." The broad language of this provision seems to deny the right of any State to issue bonds or to charter banks which would issue bank-notes or bills which would circulate as money. The Court so construed this provision as to permit the States to issue bonds and charter banks which would issue bank-notes or bills that circulated as money, even though the State owned a part or all of the stock in the bank. As early as the year 1690, the Massachusetts Colony issued paper money which was not strictly a legal tender, but the bills were issued on the faith and credit of the State. Virginia, in 1775 and 1776, issued paper called "treasury notes." Congress emitted bills of credit to a large amount. The Court had recourse to our colonial and early history, and from this source it reached the conclusion that a bill of credit was paper issued by the State on the faith and credit of the State to be circulated as money.

The Supreme Court in the Slaughter House cases, in grouping the three Amendments together, says: "It is true that only the Fifteenth Amendment, in terms, mentions the negro by speaking of his color and his slavery. But it is just as true that each of the other articles was addressed to the grievances of that race and designed to remedy them as the Fifteenth."

Again, the Court in the same case says: "In any fair and just construction of these Amendments, it is necessary to look to the purpose which we have said was the pervading spirit of them all, the evil they were designed to remedy."‡

The evil designed to be remedied by the reduction of representation clause was not the removal of every restriction upon the right of suffrage. It was not the intention to coerce the

* Wright *vs.* Hollingsworth, 1 Pet. (U. S.), 165; Meade *vs.* U. S., 9 Wall., 691.

† Craig *vs.* Missouri, 4 Pet. 410.

‡ 16 Wall., 71, 72.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States into the enactment of universal suffrage. It was not an assault upon the Australian ballot system, or a poll tax prerequisite. The simple purpose was to secure the right of the negro to vote under penalty of a loss of representation. It was designed to impose the penalty of a loss of representation in cases where the negroes were denied the right to vote either in whole or in part.

The Fifteenth Amendment expressly prohibits the very thing which it had been sought to remedy by this reduction of representation clause. This clause, therefore, was repealed by the Fifteenth Amendment. The debates in Congress and contemporary history show that the reduction of representation clause was enacted to secure negro suffrage under penalty of a loss of representation and for no other purpose. Mr. Sherman is, undoubtedly, correct in his view that this clause was repealed by the Fifteenth Amendment. He had become eminent as a lawyer before he attained to distinction as a statesman. He was a member of the Senate when the three Amendments were passed, and his opinion is based on a full knowledge, both of the law and of the facts.

To those who consider the grandfather clause, and other like exceptions to the general laws of suffrage, as ingenious devices to evade a constitutional provision, the reply is that these exceptions are all made to save the State government from anarchy and misrule. The wrong lies in the Fifteenth Amendment itself. It is a stupendous fraud on the rights of local self-government. The purposes of those who enacted it were pure and patriotic, but the question was to them, for the most part, an abstract one, and they had but little concrete knowledge of it. They were, at the time, in an abnormal condition of mind with reference to this special subject-matter, not far removed from what, in criminal law parlance, is called "emotional insanity." If this Amendment were permitted to work its sinister and malevolent way, unrestrained and unchallenged, it would destroy local self-government in the former Slave States.

Local self-government in Cuba, which was projected on the same lines, without regard to color, came suddenly to a condition of anarchy with swift and accelerated velocity. It reached this condition very much in the same way and through the same instrumentalities whereby anarchy was produced in certain States

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the period of reconstruction. Cuba will soon be knocking at the door for admission into the Union as a State, and the repeal of this Amendment will become a necessary prerequisite to such admission. Cubans could not govern Cuba with the arm of self-government thus paralyzed.

There is no form of redress to any one who feels aggrieved by the provisions of a State Constitution or a State statute, which is not repugnant to the Federal or State Constitution, except to have it repealed. The courts can furnish no remedy. The good faith of the Legislature is always presumed. The motive of the Legislature, or any of its members, in enacting a statute can never be made the subject of judicial inquiry or decision. "It would be indecent in the extreme," said Chief-Justice Marshall, "to enter into an inquiry respecting the corruption of the sovereign power of a State."* The Supreme Court, in an opinion by Chief-Justice Waite, said: "We are not at liberty to inquire into the motives of the Legislature. We can only examine into its power under the Constitution."† This Court again says: "It is quite out of the power of any court to inquire what was the intention of those who enacted the law."‡

If the second section of the Fourteenth Amendment was modified or repealed by the enactment of the Fifteenth Amendment, it would result that it would be revived by the repeal of the Fifteenth.

The act of Congress, approved on February 25th, 1871, provides "that whenever an act shall be repealed, which repealed a former act, such former act shall not thereby be revived, unless it shall be expressly so provided." This, however, would not apply to a constitutional provision, which would be controlled by the principles of the common law.

If the power of Congress to reduce representation is restored by the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment, that body would probably avail itself of the right to do so. It would then be left to the States, either to submit to such reduction, or to avail themselves of the plural or cumulative, ballot system, somewhat in the form in which it has recently been adopted in Belgium, whereby universal suffrage and the kingship are made to dwell

* Fletcher *vs.* Peck, 6 Cranch, 131.
† *Ex parte* McCardle, 7 Wall., 514.
‡ Doyle *vs.* Continental Insurance Co., 94 U. S., 541.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

together in harmony. Most, if not all, of the former Slave States would gladly accept the alternative of a reduced representation.

It would, however, be no solution of the race issue to repeal the Fifteenth Amendment and leave Section 2 of the Fourteenth remaining. The revival of Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment by a repeal of the Fifteenth would only make the race conflict more distressing. Both provisions should be repealed and the States should be left to their former freedom to regulate suffrage.

The Fifteenth Amendment is the prolific source of race conflict and race prejudice. The former Slave States find that an educational and property qualification for the white voters is unnecessary, and contrary to a sound public policy. They find, too, that with universal white and negro suffrage, a republican form of government in most of the former Slave States would be impossible, and the worst form of anarchy would prevail. The negro, on the other hand, feels that he is the favored protégé of the Federal power, and that the white men, who are his neighbors, have wrongfully withheld from him that which the General Government has solemnly conferred on him. His attitude towards the white race becomes similar to that of the heir who has been cheated out of his inheritance, by corrupt and unscrupulous combinations among other members of the family. Ill-will is thus engendered and fostered between the races, where otherwise the most cordial relations would prevail. The bad boy in the back yard knows, in advance, what will happen when he ties two cats together by the tail, which had always dwelt peaceably together by the same fireside, and throws them across the clothes-line. The Fifteenth Amendment has likewise tied the two races together, and thrown them across the national clothes-line. The horrors of the situation are shared by both races, and it would be difficult to determine which of the two races is the greater sufferer.

If the Fifteenth Amendment is repealed, the States will then be free to disallow negro suffrage, or to confer it to a limited degree on the negro race, according to the views of the people of the several States, each one of which has its own system of suffrage. The better policy would be for the white race to elect or appoint a certain number of negro voters in each county, and its subdivisions of townships, districts and wards. These voters should be elected from the negro race for their worth and merit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as good citizens, without much regard for educational or property qualifications. These rights of franchise should be subject to be taken away for acts of lawlessness and failure to maintain a high degree of well-ordered citizenship. A police power of immense magnitude would thus be created and maintained, which would be active and helpful, throughout all the ramifications of local authority. The turbulent and vicious elements among the negroes would be exposed and punished through a negro citizenship, which would be bound up with that of the white race by the ties of interest, affection and reciprocal good-will.

The measures for obtaining this repeal are difficult, but the difficulty is not insurmountable. No question is settled until it is settled aright. This question of repeal should be kept as far removed as possible from partisan politics. Not only will a short campaign of education on broad lines bring to the support of the measure the people of all parties, but the leaders of the negro race will themselves become earnest advocates for the repeal. They have not as yet made sufficient advancement in the knowledge of their situation to see that their interest in this repeal is equal to that of the white race—perhaps, indeed, greater.

The time has arrived when this repeal movement should be inaugurated.

This repeal will enable the negro to acquire a just and proper conception of his relations to the State and to the General Government. He will learn, what he does not now know, that the State, and the State alone, confers the elective franchise on its citizens, and not the General Government. He has been misled and deceived by the coercive mode by which he acquired political rights. He thinks that the nation which gave him his freedom, his citizenship and the protection of the laws, is equally potent to place on his head the crown of American sovereignty. He should be remanded to the kindergarten of the State, where he can be taught those lessons of local self-government which will enable some of his race to worthily wear the American crown.

The States which passed through the trying ordeal of reconstruction have been, and still are, zealously engaged in improving their relations to the General Government. This repeal would remove every obstruction to the complete harmony and cordiality of their Federal relations.

T. B. EDGINGTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW IRELAND—V.

BY SYDNEY BROOKS.

THE very name of the Sinn Féin party—it is pronounced "Shinn Fain" and signifies "Ourselves Alone"—gives the clue to its programme, a programme based upon the principle of self-help and self-dependence. Their policy gathers to itself, and translates into terms of political action, all those literary, spiritual and industrial impulses that are thrilling the Irish people with a new sense of nationality and of the virtues of individualism and initiative.

Their first is also their most startling proposition. It is that the Irish M.P.'s should cease to attend at Westminster, should assemble instead at Dublin, and should there form with the assistance of delegates from the various local councils and boards, a *de facto* Home Rule Parliament of their own. I omit the historical and pass on to their purely political and material reasons for advocating this step. The presence of the Irish M.P.'s in the British Parliament is an admission, they claim, of the validity of the Act of Union, nullifies the famous Declaratory Act of 1783—the Act which affirmed that the right of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of Ireland "is hereby declared to be established and ascertained forever, and shall at no time hereafter be questioned or questionable"—and recognizes the right of a foreign assembly to legislate for the Irish people. That is their first argument—that the whole case for Home Rule is surrendered when Irishmen by their votes and acts admit Englishmen, Scotchmen and Welshmen to a preponderating part in the government of Ireland. What is the use, they argue, of denying the right of the British Parliament to make laws for Ireland when Ireland sends her representatives to sit in that Parliament and to assist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in framing those laws? Such a policy, according to the Sinn Féiners' contention, is self-stultifying. It recognizes the very authority it professes to dispute, and admits in fact a right which it denies in theory. The initial move, then, in the effective assertion of Irish Nationalism should be the withdrawal of the Irish M.P.'s from Westminster.

Their second argument is that after thirty years of patient trial, Parliamentarianism has been proved a failure. It seemed to succeed for a while when Parnell was able to reduce the House of Commons to anarchy, and to fix the attention of the world upon the Irish question by persistent obstruction. But the House has amended its rules, and obstruction is no longer now a possible weapon. Parliamentarianism seemed also to stand a chance when the Irish members held the balance of power between the English parties. They used their opportunity for what it was worth, only to find that, with the House of Lords opposing an impassable barrier, it was worth nothing at all. Even assuming that the Irish Party, within the next few years, is again in a position to determine the existence of a British Ministry, or even of two or three successive Ministries, the House of Lords, with the substantial concurrence of English opinion, will still stand between them and Home Rule. Thus the Irish question is permanently postponed to the House of Lords question, and will have to bide its time until the composition of the Upper Chamber or its constitutional relations with the popular House are remodelled; and that, if at all, may not be for another generation. From the Sinn Féin standpoint, therefore, the situation roughly is that thirty years of Parliamentarianism have failed to bring Home Rule one inch nearer, have on the contrary seriously impaired its prospects, and now leave the country with a future blocked in every direction. Mr. Birrell's Bill of 1907 was a sufficient proof of how far the cause of Irish autonomy had receded since the days of Gladstone. It showed that, twenty-one years after the introduction of the first Home Rule Bill, a Liberal Government considered that a mere measure of financial and administrative devolution would satisfy the claims of Irish nationality. In the mean time, a million acres have passed out of cultivation, taxation has piled up, emigration has gone on incessantly, and Ireland remains in all educational matters just as she was—one of the most backward countries in the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For all this the Sinn Féiners blame the Irish Party and its Parliamentary policy with even greater vigor and directness than they blame the British Government. It is true that, since the 'seventies, a great revolution has been effected in the conditions of Irish land tenure, and that the struggle for the soil which has lasted for seven centuries is now within sight of its close. But what was it, ask the Sinn Féiners, that carried through that revolution? Was it speeches on the floor of the House of Commons or was it agitation in Ireland; Parliamentary tactics or Fenianism and the Land League? They answer without hesitation that the motive power which alone made the agrarian revolution possible, just as it won Catholic emancipation and forced the abolition of the tithes, was agitation in Ireland. Practically all the great measures that have revolutionized Irish society and politics since the Union have not, they assert, been so much granted by England as extorted by Ireland—and extorted, not by the rhetoric or manœuvres of the Irish Party at Westminster, but by the action of Irishmen in Ireland. In their view, agitation at Westminster has done nothing; agitation in Ireland, resistance in Ireland, has done everything. As it has been, say the Sinn Féiners, so it is, and so it always will be. Ireland will get nothing from England by asking for it or by whining about her "rights" in the House of Commons. She will get nothing anyway until she has convinced England either that she can take it without leave or that it is to England's interest to grant it. Trusting to England's "generosity" or "sense of justice" is quixotic. The only sound policy for Irishmen to follow is that which causes England the greatest annoyance and brings her under the stress of the heaviest compulsion. The Sinn Féiners proceed altogether upon the principle that England, unmoved by appeals to justice, will always sooner or later give way to fear, and that tactics in the House of Commons which neither paralyze the workings of that assembly, nor make the Irish vote essential to either of the chief English parties, nor influence in any way the House of Lords, are, therefore, little better than an expensive futility. Just as the exigencies of politics made it necessary that the policy of Butt should be superseded by the policy of Parnell, so the Sinn Féiners claim that the time has come for a further and more aggressive advance.

But it is above all things as a matter of political or revolution-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ary ethics, or at least of national self-respect, that Ireland is now being urged to withdraw her representatives from Westminster. Parliamentarianism, say the Sinn Féiners, acts upon the national energies like a soporific. The people quickly come to think that they have done all that can be expected of them when they elect a certain number of real or professed Home Rulers to act for them in Parliament. No tangible sacrifice of any kind is asked of them; they shout and pass unbridled resolutions and are fed on rhetoric; there are very few contested elections and therefore nothing in the nature of a political education; the "machine," directed usually by the local trader and money-lender and publican—who are often not three persons, but one—runs things to suit itself; and the political contribution of "the people" towards the cause of Home Rule takes for the most part the form of sitting listlessly at home and awaiting results they do next to nothing towards producing. It is precisely this habit of delegating functions that the Sinn Féiners wish to drive out of Irish politics. Their aim is to substitute for it a system of universal and individual service. Parliamentarianism, in their view, destroys all sense of personal responsibility and initiative. It deals with a vague collective entity which it calls "the electorate" or "the people," whereas the appeal of the Sinn Féiners is directly and solely to the single citizen. Moreover, so long as Ireland is represented at Westminster, London and not Dublin is the Irish capital; the people are irresistibly drawn into looking across the Channel for help; they grow absorbed in the spectacle of small Parliamentary manœuvres; their belief in the virtue of Acts of Parliament to remedy economic ills is fatally encouraged; and, while perpetually speculating on what England is going to do for Ireland, they forget that there is a good deal which Ireland might and should do for herself, and that Irish progress rests ultimately with the individual Irishman in Ireland. This is a habit of mind that destroys a just sense of values, saps self-reliance, and debilitates the national character; and the Sinn Féiners make it the prime object of their attack. Parliamentarianism in their eyes is mere play-acting, and fosters some of the worst weaknesses in the Irish temperament by dissipating the sense of responsibility and distracting the popular mind from the duties immediately in front of it. The policy, on the other hand, that they propose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treats every Irishman not as an electoral pawn but as a living force, appeals to and relies upon the individual, and asks for its fulfilment the constant practice of a first-hand patriotism.

I come now to the policy itself. The first article in the Sinn Féin creed is, as I have said, that the Irish M.P.'s should abandon Westminster and remain in Ireland. But that is only the negative beginning of the programme they have mapped out. Indeed, what makes their policy so interesting a novelty in Irish politics is not merely that it addresses itself to all Irishmen irrespective of creed or class, not merely that it opposes sectarianism just as it opposes every other agency of disunion, but that its spirit and purpose are essentially constructive. The real work of the Irish M.P.'s, according to the Sinn Féiners' calculations, will only begin when, after leaving Westminster and reinforced by delegates from the urban and rural bodies of five-sixths of Ireland, they assemble in Dublin in a Council of Three Hundred. The first result of this dramatic translation, it is supposed, would be an outpouring of contributions from the Irish people themselves and from their kinsmen and sympathizers in America and Australia, and at the same time a considerable diminution in the expense hitherto incurred in supporting the Irish Party in London. With these moneys the initial action of the Council would be to appoint an Irish Consular Service, and "to devote a portion of the $125,000 Ireland at present expends in keeping eighty Irishmen in London to keeping one-fourth that number of Irishmen stationed in the capitals and commercial centres of foreign countries, where a market may be found for Irish produce." From this it would go on to superintend the expenditures of the local elective bodies throughout the country on a uniform system, and the local bodies, it is not doubted and, indeed, when once the primary step is assumed, need not be doubted, would be quick to obey the resolutions of the Council and to give them the effective force of law. Thus if the Council were to decree, as of course it would, that every penny spent by the local bodies on food, clothing, furniture, bedding, building materials, medicines and medical appliances, and so on, must be spent in Ireland, the Irish farmers and manufacturers would find themselves in the enjoyment of a profitable and patriotic form of Protection.

Again, the Irish County Councils have power to levy a penny

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the pound for technical instruction, and to receive as much again from the Department of Agriculture. They have also the power, with the concurrence of the Rural Councils, to raise another penny in the pound for libraries. The total yield from these sources would amount, it is estimated, to $625,000 a year. This sum the Council of Three Hundred, without infringing any law, could order to be laid out in furnishing bounties to some new industry and in founding libraries, museums and gymnasia where the youth of the country might be mentally and physically fitted to take an active part in the national struggle. The Department of Agriculture, which, in a sense, is popularly controlled and which is doing work of enormous importance in every county throughout Ireland, could also be brought under the direction of the Council of Three Hundred. So, too, the Council would infallibly strive to man the Harbor Boards with avowed Sinn Féiners, whose policy would be to throw the bulk of the port dues on manufactured goods and to keep and publish month by month a list of such goods, with their source of origin and the names and locality of their consignees—this for the purpose of stigmatizing and discouraging the use of English instead of Irish manufactures. The Sinn Féiners are all Protectionists of the List school, and, starting with and from the individual, are bent upon employing every agency for the simultaneous upbuilding of Irish agriculture and industries. It is as part of this policy that they propose that the General Council of County Councils should undertake a general survey of Ireland's natural resources, of her coal, stone and peat especially, and should invite Irish-American money for their development. And it is also as a leading part of the same policy that they emphasize the necessity of reviving the Irish merchant marine.

The Council of Three Hundred would also, through the medium of the County Councils and the Department of Agriculture, do everything in its power to dispossess the cattle and re-establish tillage. It would endeavor to formulate a scheme of canal and river transit under the direction of the County Councils. It would order the allocation of part of the moneys raised by local taxation to the work of reafforesting the central plain of Ireland. It would classify all the offices and appointments within the gift of the local bodies, throw them open to competitive examination, and make a knowledge of Irish history,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Irish language and of Irish resources obligatory on all candidates in all grades—thus evolving in time a purely Irish civil service. It would follow the example of Papineau in Canada and of Deak in Hungary, by instituting voluntary Arbitration Courts, presided over by judges appointed by the Council and confined to such barristers and solicitors as the Council might sanction after they had renounced their practice in the British Courts. In the same way by voluntary subscriptions from the parents, by inviting contributions from wealthy Irish-Americans, and by co-operating with bodies like the Gaelic League and the Christian Brothers, the Council would hope to build up an educational system, complete from primary school to university, that would be animated throughout by national ideas and in which Gaelic would be the chief medium of instruction. The Sinn Féiners further complain of the hostility of the Irish Stock Exchange to the listing of Irish securities. "The position at present," they say, "is that the British Government-controlled Stock Exchange in Ireland will not, as the Stock Exchange in every other country does, make a market for local stocks, and that the small capitalist is thus compelled to invest his capital outside Ireland, in ninety-five per cent. of cases in British undertakings, to the immense financial advantage of England and to the financial loss of Ireland." To remedy this, the Council would call into existence a National Stock Exchange by ordering the public bodies it represented to transact all their business in the buying and selling of stocks through such brokers only as had engaged to constitute themselves into that National Exchange; and, by further deflecting the deposits of the local bodies, it might found a National Bank that would neither refuse to cash checks made out in Gaelic, nor send gold to London and take paper in exchange, nor invest Irish money in British securities instead of in Irish enterprises. Two other items on the Sinn Féiners' programme have still to be mentioned. They vehemently exclude from their ranks all members of the British armed forces, and the Council of Three Hundred would undoubtedly make an anti-enlisting campaign one of its first cares. The Sinn Féiners are also strong advocates of temperance, not for reasons of physiology or morals, but because "by the simple process of reducing by one-half her present expenditure on drink, Ireland can decrease the British revenue by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$12,500,000 a year, or practically the whole of the actual profit she now makes on her government of Ireland."

Such is the Sinn Féin policy—a policy of national boycott directed against England, aiming at the creation of a bilingual, self-contained, self-sufficing, wholly Irish Ireland, and prosecuted by the sacrifices, the individual exertions, and the ordered unity of the people themselves. Its appeal, as I have tried to show, is altogether to the individual. It is by acting on the individual that the Sinn Féiners hope to put a stop to enlistments in the British Army or the Royal Irish Constabulary, and to shame Irishmen out of sitting on any British Commission, or accepting any post that involves taking an oath of loyalty to the British Crown. It is by inducing the individual to drink less and smoke less that they look forward to reducing England's revenue from Ireland below her expenditure in it. It is by impressing upon the individual as well as upon public bodies the patriotic duty of buying only Irish goods and products that they play their part in promoting Irish industries and agriculture. It is by always preaching at the individual that he is an Irishman that they seek to encourage him in learning Gaelic. For the rest, the Sinn Féin policy is to thwart and weaken England, positively by passive resistance, negatively by building up a strong and prosperous Ireland. They are all on the side of material improvement so long as it comes from within—that is to say, so long as it is improvement by Irishmen, not exploitation by Englishmen. Thus while supporting every legal form of resistance to the British Government, and while always proclaiming Great Britain to be the enemy, the Sinn Féiners have a strong constructive side to their programme, and zealously forward every movement and every project that promises to make Ireland more Irish, more prosperous and more self-reliant. They are not "physical force" men. They see no necessity to be. They urge Irishmen not to fight England by arms, still less to whimper and manœuvre in her House of Commons, but to stay at home in Ireland, ignore her, boycott her, and quietly assume the administration of Irish affairs. They represent, of course, the extremists of Irish Nationalism. They are the "Young Irelanders" of the twentieth century, pursuing the "Young Ireland" policy, but pursuing it by new methods.

It is scarcely necessary at present to discuss the Sinn Féin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

idea from the standpoint of English interests and policy, or to estimate its precise degree of practicability. Matters have not yet advanced that far. The Sinn Féiners have first to convert Ireland before they can hope to conquer England, and to enumerate the weapons of resistance and retaliation that repose in the British armory or to forecast the nature and issue of the struggle that would ensue between the two countries is, and must long remain, superfluous. Their policy is borrowed from the movement of passive resistance which Deak organized against Austria. But Deak only won because he was backed up by the virile Magyar spirit and because Austria was twice struck down by foreign foes. It will be time enough to consider what chances an Ireland committed to Sinn Féin possesses against England when Ireland is—what at present she is very far from being—actually committed to Sinn Féin. In other words, the importance of the movement in its present stage is Irish and not Anglo-Irish, national and not international; and the only angle from which it can as yet be profitably approached is one that is exclusively related to purely Irish politics. If Ireland had the intelligence to adopt Sinn Féin, and the tenacity to stick to it, one would then have a new and much more involved situation to deal with. But for the present it is not in England but in Ireland that the Sinn Féiners find their most formidable and immediate obstacles, and all their energies so far have been devoted to persuading their own countrymen to accept their programme and stand by it.

Many influences are working with them. They are a young party, and a vigorous and enthusiastic one. Their policy is bold and captivating. It has struck the Irish imagination; it has already enlisted the support of the more ardent youth of the country. The Sinn Féiners, moreover, profit by the disenchantment with the tactics and personnel of the Irish Party which has been growing in Ireland ever since the Parnellite split. I have already touched on this factor, and I shall have occasion to return to it and examine it in greater detail later on. They profit, again, by the many new and vital impulses that are stirring in Irish life. I am persuaded that the master-fact of present-day Ireland is the growth of individualism, of initiative, of self-reliance; and nowhere in Nationalist politics, except among the Sinn Féiners, do these qualities find expression. Like all other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish agitators the Sinn Féiners are brilliant journalists. Their weekly organ, "Sinn Féin," is one of the most militant, lucid and outspoken papers I have ever read. In some of the cities, in Dublin especially, they have shown a considerable electoral strength. Several avowed Sinn Féiners sit on the Dublin Corporation. Many ex-members of the Irish Party have joined their ranks, and, after the introduction and rejection of Mr. Birrell's Bill of 1907, three Irish M.P.'s broke away from the Parliamentarians and seceded to the Sinn Féiners. One of them a few months ago resigned his seat in North Leitrim and stood again in the Sinn Féin cause. He was defeated; but he polled a vote that would not have disgraced a wealthy organization of twenty years' standing, and it is certain that no Unionist, no Devolutionist, could have done half so well. The ferment is undoubtedly spreading. All that is most honest, most intelligent and most stalwart in Nationalist Ireland is turning towards Sinn Féin. After five years' work the Sinn Féiners are recognized as offering a policy that is at once a serious rival, and the only possible alternative, to Parliamentarianism.

But they have a long row to hoe. Their organization cannot begin to compare with that of the Irish Party, and they have little money. Far as they have advanced, and remarkable as are their successes, they cannot as yet be said to be within measurable distance of weaning Ireland from the Irish Party. Their strength lies almost exclusively in the towns. Rural Ireland so far has been scarcely touched by their propaganda, and is still securely barricaded against its advent by the time-honored alliance of priest, publican and politician. A few individual priests have joined the new organization, but the priesthood as a whole is undoubtedly against it, and, if it develops much more strength, will probably attack it openly. The Sinn Féiners take the secular view of things educational as instinctively as they take the national view of things political and the Protectionist view of things fiscal. They are compact of stiffness and independence; they are wholly opposed to clerical domination in the schools. That in itself is enough to draw down upon them the thunderbolts of ecclesiastical wrath. The Church, after many years of adroit manipulation, has secured a hold upon the Irish Party which will not easily be shaken off. It is far more interested in excluding the laity from the management of the schools

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than in promoting Home Rule. It knows that the Irish Party will never dare to lift a finger against the clerical control of primary education, and it suspects, and I should judge rightly suspects, that the Sinn Féiners would prove by no means so complaisant. It has, therefore, no intention of deposing the Irish Party for the sake of installing Sinn Féin. As for the publicans, whose political influence is second only to that of the priests, they are against Sinn Féin if only because Sinn Féin advocates temperance; while the Irish Party itself and its adherents in the press and the members of the various "leagues" of which it is composed, repay with interest the Sinn Féiners' ridicule and invective. Moreover, although there are several men of real intellectual force among the Sinn Féiners, they have not as yet produced a leader who has appealed to the national imagination; and in Ireland, even more than in most countries, that is an almost fatal deficiency.

But perhaps the most serious difficulty ahead of the Sinn Féiners is that their policy depends for its success upon sacrifice, persistence and self-denial. The Irish people are not incapable of sacrifice and self-denial, but I think their history shows that those qualities have hitherto been mainly evoked when there was some prospect of a tangible, material reward. The Irish have struggled long and resolutely for their hold upon the land. But have they the fineness, the patriotism, the idealism to struggle equally long and resolutely for Home Rule? The land, as I have said, is life; Home Rule is sentiment. It has yet to be proved that the latter appeals to the Irish people with even half the intensity of the former. And yet the new spirit of hardihood and self-help that is penetrating the Irish character, and the new conception of nationality that is beginning to find a place in the Irish comprehension, are factors that already tell powerfully on the Sinn Féin side. Their policy may be fantastic and impossible, though I do not myself altogether think that it is; but the idea of virility and reliance that it embodies is one that is bound to exercise a profound and disintegrating influence on the Irish Party, and may end by superseding it by a broader, healthier and more personal nationalism.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

(To be continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR DEPARTMENTS OF SCHOOL HYGIENE.

BY WILLIAM H. ALLEN.

ON the opening day of school in September, 1907, the daily press of the United States published stories regarding the home conditions of 1,400 out of 160,000 New York children found by school physicians to have defects of vision, breathing, hearing, nutrition, etc. Unless the children of Manhattan are different from other children in the country, it was estimated that an examination would find 12,000,000 in need of dental, medical, ocular care or better nourishment. The defects would be distributed approximately as follows: malnutrition, 1,248,000; enlarged glands, 5,460,000; swollen tonsils and adenoids, 7,092,000; bad teeth, 8,988,000. Accompanying these figures was the statement that the term "physical deterioration of school children" was a misnomer, and that the only new thing about these defects was the recently awakened interest in them. Notwithstanding the conservative, constructive character of the report made by the Committee on Physical Welfare of School Children, as the result of a year's scientific study, shrieking head-lines were made to sound an alarm—"Millions Diseased," "12,000,000 Defective School Children," "Millions Unfit for Schooling." Editorials followed, some using the superlatives of sensation, while others cynically poked fun at "statisticians with whom one swallow makes a summer." The majority, however, treated the situation gravely, wresting from the announcement three clear messages: (1) Beware of the bogie Socialism; (2) "cheat the hospitals, poorhouses and insane asylums of the future" by giving at school free meals, free eye-glasses, free shoes, free medical care; (3) let every parent, teacher, school superintendent and health officer set about to remove conditions that produce physical defects.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The battle will be waged for years to come. Do-nothingism is already unhorsed. The issue lies between the second and third points of view, between doing and getting done. The outcome will depend upon the persistence with which are presented such significant facts and practical conclusions as those summarized in the report that precipitated the discussion.

But are there really 12,000,000 school children who need medical, dental, ocular care or better nourishment? Do physical defects universally hamper school progress? Is it probable that considerable numbers of children reared on farms and in small towns have the defects found in 225 schools of Manhattan? Exact numbers and proportions nobody knows. We do know that mouth-breathing, headaches, nervousness, dizziness, constipation, ear trouble, weak eyes, decayed teeth, prolonged colds and infection, wherever they exist, reduce vitality and power to assimilate either food or instruction. The chances are that, in any class of thirty boys and girls, twenty need care not yet given, two will be under-nourished, nine will have enlarged glands, twelve will have adenoids or enlarged tonsils, or both; while practically all will need dental care, from fifteen to twenty will be in serious need of such care. Though special training is required to trace defects back to causes, a casual scrutiny of the average class, whether in country or city, will enable even pupils themselves to pick out those children who are "different," "queer" or "dopey." But the question whether the proportion of children needing attention is two out of three, four out of seven, or nine out of ten is a detail. The fact of facts is that in every school, whether among the tamaracks of upper Michigan, or the elms of Boston, such need of attention to school children exists. Just who and how many these children are, to just what extent backwardness, truancy, "dropping out" and industrial inefficiency are due to hitherto neglected defects, it should be made the school's business to determine.

That physical defects recognize no limits of geography, race and income is illustrated by Freddie L. and his classmates of good American stock. They live at the seashore. Throughout their twelve years they have lived in a veritable Eldorado of health and nature beauty. Groves and grains and dune flora vie with the blues of ocean and sky in resting the eye, and in preparing the soul for that harmony that is said to make for sound living.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, to a child, Freddie's friends are experts on patent medicines and on the heredity that is alleged to be responsible for bad temper, running sores, anæmia and weak eyes. Freddie is particularly favored. His well-to-do parents have supplied him with ponies and games and bicycles. Nothing prevents his breathing salt air fresh from the North Pole, but hermetically sealed windows. The father thinks it absurd to make a fuss over adenoids. Didn't he have them and doesn't he weigh 200 pounds and "make good money"? The mother "never heard tell" of operations when she taught school, supposes her boy needs one, but "just can't bear to see the dear child hurt." As for Freddie, he breathes through his mouth, talks through his nose, grows indifferent to boys' fun, fails of promotion in school, and fears that he "won't be strong in spite of all the patent medicines I've taken." Father, mother and Freddie feel profound pity for the child of poverty in a New York flat.

Freddie also illustrates the second general set of facts reported for New York children. Few of the physical defects of school children can be corrected by nourishment alone; the cause of eye trouble is often not reached by eye-glasses. Europeans have mistakenly tried to cure adenoids, eye strain, malnutrition by giving a school meal without correcting bad ventilation, decayed teeth, improper home feeding, hurried and irregular eating, unhygienic habits. The best diet in the world will prove ineffective if tonsils, adenoids and bad teeth once get a good start. They do get the start on the avenue as well as in the alley. They have a start with Freddie that food cannot check. Of the children reported for malnutrition, only 145 out of 1,400—less than one-seventh—had home incomes of ten dollars a week or less, while one-third had over twenty dollars a week. The chief difference that is reported between the very poor and the comfortably situated is that a larger proportion of the latter refused to believe that their children could have any ailments.

Thirdly, children's physical defects are, in general, traceable to methods of eating rather than to quantity or character of food, and not so much to food as to decayed teeth, and unsanitary school and home conditions. The New York figures undoubtedly—so experts declare—understate the number of children needing dental care. As used in New York, "bad teeth" means large and numerous cavities that decrease power to digest and that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

furnish fertile breeding-ground for disease germs. Here, again, there seems no reason to believe that country children are more favored than slum children. In fact, the city child, however poor, is even nearer to a dentist and to hospital and dispensary treatment than the child of the cross-roads, the small town or even the rich suburb. The country over, "baby" teeth are allowed to rot themselves loose, thus frequently infecting the second teeth. Permanent teeth receive little, if any, attention until after school age. This fact is of importance, because a large part of the defects so far discovered could result from neglect of teeth. Several German cities make a great point of compelling attention to teeth of school children; and certain insurance companies save death premiums by giving free dental care to policy-holders. The New York Children's Aid Society organized a short time ago a dental clinic-school where, under the leadership of Herbert L. Wheeler, D.D.S., twenty pioneer dentist-teachers have set out to convince the poor that dentistry is a profession for preventing, not merely for decorating, holes in the teeth. As for unsanitary school conditions, New York and sister cities have no apologies to make to rural districts. Unadjustable desks, dry sweeping, feather dusters, shiny blackboards, harassing discipline that wrecks nerves, excessive home study, are not peculiar to great cities. In a little Western town, a competition between two self-governing brigades for merit-points was determined by the amount of home study; looking back fifteen years, I can see that I was encouraging anæmic and over-ambitious children to rob themselves of play, sleep and vitality. Many a rural school violates more laws of health than any city factory. I never found in the slums of Glasgow, Dublin, London, Philadelphia or New York unsanitary conditions so revolting as I have seen on the grounds of American country schools.

The New York investigators carefully separated *significant facts* from *conclusions,* because the purpose of their study was not to bias opinion, but to encourage constant study of children's physical welfare. Most of their conclusions bear upon a constructive programme for local, county, State and national Departments of School Hygiene. School meals, as a remedy for physical defects, are opposed not because they would cost too much and not because they are Socialistic, but because they are inadequate. Even though free meals were adopted as a means of insuring

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

better discipline and more punctual attendance, the greater problem would remain untouched of stopping the manufacture of physical defects by home and school conditions. Some plan must be devised by which the school can help the child who suffers because of neglect or ignorance in the use of supposedly adequate income, as well as the child who suffers because of inadequate home income.

Whatever else is tried, the following steps are urged as indispensable; perhaps, after they are taken, there will be fewer reasons for free meals, free eye-glasses and free relief at school; if they are not taken, agitation for free meals and free eye-glasses, etc., will rapidly gain momentum. These steps constitute a programme that is immediately practicable in all States.

(1) A thorough physical examination of all children of all schools, public, parochial and private.

(2) Notification of parents and family physicians as to children's needs. That tens of thousands of records of defects piled up at health headquarters do not help children has been conclusively proved in New York.

(3) "Follow-up" notices with visits to inform and persuade parents to correct defects and to remove their causes. Of 631 examinations so followed up in one Manhattan district, all but 52 parents took the proper steps; 103 after the first notice from the Health Department, 165 after a first visit to the home, 106 after a second visit and 38 after a third visit.

(4) Enforcement of existing laws and securing proper authority, where this is now lacking, to compel obstinate parents to take necessary steps. Seldom will this force be required. Children themselves will prefer to comply with school requirements to being marked among their fellows for non-compliance. Mouth breathers do not want to be called "fly-catchers" and "dopes." Parents do not want to hold their children or other children back. Nor do they willingly sacrifice future earning power to present convenience or to prejudice.

(5) Periodic re-examination of school children during school life. The school authorities of New York City are now considering the adoption of an individual record card that will show side by side the physical and mental history of the child for eight years.

(6) Physical examination of children when applying for work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certificates. The children of Rochester, New York, are grateful to Dr. Goler for telling them how to increase their earning power by correcting physical defects or by avoiding dangerous trades for which they are physically unfit.

(7) Use of information gained regarding physical effects of bad living conditions to secure enforcement of health and tenement laws, restrictions of hours of labor, control of dangerous trades, prevention of child labor. The best possible index to any community's social and industrial problems is the physical welfare of its school children. Having read the index, the school should make its story known to everybody.

(8) School buildings and school curriculum should be so constructed and so managed that they cannot themselves either produce or aggravate physical defects.

(9) The effect of school environment and school requirements upon the child should be constantly studied. Teachers should be examined and re-examined for their vitality, which exercises an important influence upon that of the pupil.

(10) Hygiene should be so taught that children will learn their health rights and how to maintain them.

The execution of such a comprehensive programme requires some new mechanisms not hitherto known to the American school world. Because defects are as general as schools, a workable plan must provide for rural as well as city schools, for children in Alaska, Porto Rico and the Philippines, as well as for those of Boston, Cleveland and New York. If all children of all schools are to be benefited, the National Bureau of Education, all State and colonial departments of education, all county and city school headquarters, must organize departments of school hygiene. National and State departments should be equipped to compile and publish results of examinations, follow-up work, etc., in individual schools. County and city departments should not only compile and publish facts, but should gather them through examinations, follow-up work, supervision of school hygiene, etc. County and city departments must be "working biological engineers." State and National departments will be more effective if they confine themselves to the rôle of "consulting biological engineers." The pupil will be examined by a physician, and his mother taught by a nurse, belonging to or associated with a city, county or provincial department of school hygiene. The records

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of both nurse and physician will help teachers and principals to take more intelligent personal interest in their pupils. The work of physician and nurse will be supervised and recorded by Department officers. Quarterly or annual reports will be sent to the State Department, which will stimulate uniformity up to a minimum standard of efficiency, as State Boards of Education now encourage a high percentage of attendance both by money grants *per capita* of attendance and by comparing schools of the same size. The State Department will send its results in summary to the National Bureau, which will send back to each State the best fruits of the experience of all States. Given such co-operative and cumulative attention to the physical welfare of the nation's school children, and many of our grave social and industrial problems would assume aspects less forbidding. Down below the question of child labor is the question of child vitality; more important than under-age is under-strength. Behind problems of pedagogics are problems of living and earning. Departments of school hygiene would harness 500,000 teachers, thousands of physicians and nurses and 20,000,000 children to the fact-making, fact-gathering and fact-recording staff now endeavoring to secure education that will fit the child for industry, for parenthood and for citizenship.

Much of the machinery necessary to this plan for efficient departments of school hygiene already exists. Local, county, State and National school headquarters are in the habit of asking questions and making suggestions concerning pupil, teacher and school work. County superintendents make the rounds, criticising and suggesting. District superintendents in cities do the same. All that is needed is to include *physical welfare* among the items to be critically noted. A step in the right direction has been taken by United States Commissioner Brown, who is asking Congress to grant funds to enable the National Bureau of Education to engage "a specialist in the welfare of children to diffuse information and spread a wholesome influence touching these things." State Commissioners are equipped to pass on this information. They do not need much additional help to send out circulars of instruction and inquiry. But an occasional examiner such as has been sent out by many State boards of health or of education is a poor substitute for a State department of school hygiene, always inquiring and always getting things done by city and county de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partments. Nor does the Massachusetts law go far enough when it leaves it optional with school boards to have school children inspected. Having recognized that every child has a right to health, to breathe through the nose, to see without pain, to clean atmosphere, floors and grounds, the State should see that these health rights are enforced equally in all its schools. Where schools receive State money it is quite as fair to require assurance that health needs are provided for as to require forty days' attendance. It is for seeing that information is used by schools receiving State money, or receiving State protection, that additional employees are needed. In both State and county offices, clerical help is required to send out notices to parents and to keep track of results. From individual schools visits must be paid to dilatory, obstinate and uninformed parents. Where communities are not large enough to furnish special nurses and physicians, the county superintendent will be given a visiting nurse; with proper supervision it should be practicable to utilize local physicians for examinations where teachers acting under instructions cannot be expected to get trustworthy results. When such activities are recorded at county school headquarters, a new meaning will be given to county visiting and subjects not shopworn will be discussed at county institutes.

A city department of school hygiene has been organized in Cleveland; Chicago has a child-study bureau; Philadelphia and Boston are doing much for their children. But New York comes nearer to a comprehensive plan to-day than is found elsewhere in America. The chess men are on the board; they only need to be arranged so that pawns, knights, queens and kings are identified and placed. (1) General supervision of children's physical welfare is in the hands of a director of physical training who has several efficient aides. While the greater part of their attention has heretofore been given to gymnastics, breathing exercises, dances and games, they are expected to influence the hygiene practised at school, ventilation, etc. The special studies of backward children, of physiological age, have emphasized the need for curriculum and discipline fitted to physique. (2) School buildings are designed by an architect who is a student of ventilation, lighting, etc. The fact that his results are frequently not satisfactory to the physical directors and teachers does not decrease the importance of the fact that New York recognizes the necessity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of having experts on construction. (3) Physicians both examine children for defects and inspect for evidences of infection. (4) Nurses treat children for skin troubles, nits, etc., and go to the homes to teach parents how to care for children's heads, where to have adenoids removed, etc. (5) Health headquarters, principals and physicians send formal notices and informal messages to parents and family physicians urging attention to the child's troubles. Mothers' meetings are held and popular lectures given. (6) Individual record cards tell teacher and principal each child's particular needs. (7) A handbook shows what dispensaries, hospitals, reliefs and fresh-air agencies are within reach of each school. Physical training, proper instruction in hygiene, shower baths, swimming-pools, roof gardens, gymnasiums, athletic leagues, rifle-shooting contests—all of these things are found in some parts of New York.

New York has everything—but a plan! It has no co-ordinating factor to see that all children of all sections enjoy the minimum of health protection. It has not systematized the plan of following up notices and visits. Nor is there co-ordination of the many official and private agencies for promoting child welfare. But the community is so convinced by work already done that conditions are now ripe for a Department of School Hygiene. The head of this Department should be directly responsible to the Board of Education through the city superintendent, and should be in the superintendent's cabinet. He should have responsibility for using the information regarding non-contagious diseases and physical defects discovered at school, as well as contagious diseases for which children are not excluded, such as ringworm, pediculosis, etc. After the school and district physician has diagnosed, the school nurse, subject to orders of the Department of School Hygiene, should wash heads, give baths or teach mothers, according to the exigencies of the case. The Department should be responsible for keeping records of examination and re-examination on individual record cards that follow the child from class to class or school to school during school life. It should also be responsible for follow-up work, for inspection of buildings, for the hygiene practised and the hygiene taught in school, for criticisms of curriculum, building and grounds so far as these injuriously affect health, and for making effective use of knowledge gained by the Department. Health benefits should be equalized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by showing which sections are deprived of health rights. The sacrifice of child vitality should be prevented in kindergarten, high and normal schools, by honor pupils as well as the backward. Teachers' training schools should be especially supervised and future teachers trained to habits of health and to methods of teaching hygiene. The examinations and re-examinations could properly be left with the school and district inspectors of the Department of Health. Thus statements regarding the physical needs of the child would come to school officers with the prestige of the sanitary code behind them. An important change was made in Manhattan last fall whereby instead of having two physicians in one large district—one for contagious diseases in homes and another for schools—each physician is given a small district and expected to do all of the work in that district for both school and home. Experiment in a few districts recently proved that the physician comes to know his district intimately and becomes known by the people of that district. Because known to all school children, teachers, school and hospital officials, parents, etc., he may become a district character more important than a political leader. As a ward boss holds each leader responsible for a full vote on primary and election days, so the Health Department holds each school and district physician responsible for reducing physical defects and contagion.

To this programme for departments of school hygiene the chief obstacle is ignorance as to the need for them and as to the benefits they would bring. The cure for ignorance is information. Facts properly presented will also cure prejudice and prevent superficial judgment. Facts and facts alone—the true reading of experience—will settle right the controverted questions as to jurisdiction of health and education boards, interference with school discipline, increasing or decreasing the teacher's burdens, justice of taxing one man for the health of another's child. The massing of facts is easy for National, State and county headquarters for school knowledge. Therefore the importance of beginning at these headquarters the organization of special departments of school hygiene. A sufficient number of teachers have already found their burdens lightened and their energies freed by physical examination of children and by proper follow-up work to convince the teaching profession, if only the facts can be circulated as are the virtues of a new method of teaching penmanship.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Taxpayers, sceptical of money-saving devices that cost money, will listen to teachers' statements that for every dollar spent on a department of school hygiene ten to one hundred dollars can be saved by removing the defects that made it necessary to take children over the same work two or more times. To write a note to a parent, to telephone to a family physician, dispensary, relief society or fresh-air agency is demonstrably much cheaper than giving things away at school. It is cheaper for schools to have a department that will set to work in the interest of school children all the social agencies of a community, than to break down trying to do school work and that of hospitals, restaurants, stores. It is better to have prohibited the sale of impure milk anywhere within city limits than to sell pure milk to school children.

American cities are compelled to choose not between examination that costs a trifle and absolute neglect, but between examination *plus* follow-up work, on the one hand, and free relief at school, on the other; between teaching that removes the causes of defects and giving that neglects causal conditions. Free meals were made a political issue in the last parliamentary election in Great Britain. Already, America's greatest professional friend of the downtrodden has through his papers laid the foundation for a political agitation in favor of free meals, free eye-glasses, free patches of every kind. Labor in Britain was decoyed by talk of free meals. Labor in America will outvote Mr. Conservative when free meals are made a political issue, unless the laborer sees that the free meal remedy is the lesser of two benefits. When the issue is child welfare *versus* money, opposition to taxes will lose. Free meals cannot be stopped on economic grounds or by theoretical or hysterical opposition to paternalism. But, given the clear issue, permanent benefits to child *versus* palliative measures, and labor will choose as wisely as capital. European countries, whose free gifts are held up to us as models, have failed utterly to cope with their own industrial and social problems. They feed children, but they also feed able-bodied men and women. Behind every child who needs free meals is a home needing attention. For securing that attention, for enlisting the intelligence of the parent in efforts to rear children capable of self-help and sound living, for giving all communities a definite basis for constructive social work, efficient departments of school hygiene are requisite.

WILLIAM H. ALLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ALLEGED PASSING OF WAGNER.

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN.

THE process of consigning the works of Richard Wagner to the capacious dust-bin where lie the discarded products of the world's art goes energetically forward. An English critic of authority, Mr. E. A. Baughn, has lately been giving voice—in what he calls, with a touch of pathos, "the apostasy of a Wagnerian"—to doubts concerning the artistic impeccability of the tyrant of Bayreuth; not long ago Mr. Philip Hale celebrated publicly the recrudescence of Italian opera and the inferential eclipse of the music-drama according to Wagner; and now comes Mr. Reginald de Koven with tidings and prophecies of sombre import. In the April issue of this REVIEW he sought to show, in a spirit obviously free from carping and prejudice, that the decline and fall of the author of "Tristan und Isolde" was an event which had begun to cast its dire shadows into the present: he dared, in short, to announce the definitive bursting of what vivacious persons have called "the Wagner bubble," though he did not disdain to permit a certain reverence to temper the harshness of his declaration.

Let us consider Mr. de Koven's allegations, and his reasons for the belief that is in him, since he is by far the most confident witness of Wagner's downfall who has thus far put himself upon record.

Mr. de Koven believes that he is justified in accepting New York as a reasonable criterion of operatic taste, for he regards it as, to-day, "the principal operatic centre of the world." Proceeding then to a consideration of the past season of opera at the Metropolitan Opera House,* he affirms that New York "has

* Wagner's works are not in the répertoire of the Manhattan Opera House.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never known a season when fewer of Wagner's works have been performed." It is unfortunate that Mr. de Koven should have elected to found any part of his argument upon this assertion; for it is not true that New York "has never known a season when fewer of Wagner's works have been performed" than were performed during the past season. In any such contention as Mr. de Koven's, it may be conceded that the truth of the matter rests, in a considerable degree, upon the mere statistics of performances. Now, these statistics show that there have been, since the end of the German régime at the Metropolitan in 1891, many seasons during which Wagner was less frequently heard than during the season of 1907-08. According to the records, New York heard during the past season thirty performances of works by Wagner, and these performances were apportioned among nine operas and music-dramas: "Die Meistersinger," "Der Fliegende Holländer," "Lohengrin," "Tristan und Isolde," "Tannhäuser," "Die Walküre," "Siegfried," "Rheingold," and "Die Götterdämmerung"—all of his works that now hold the stage except "Rienzi" and "Parsifal." As against this record, we may set that of the season of 1891-92, when there were only eight performances of three of Wagner's works ("Der Fliegende Holländer," "Lohengrin," "Die Meistersinger"); the season of 1893-94, when three operas by Wagner ("Tannhäuser," "Lohengrin," "Die Meistersinger") were heard, in all, ten times; the season of 1894-95, when there were only seven performances of two works by Wagner ("Lohengrin" and "Die Meistersinger"); the season of 1895-96, when the Wagner record was twenty-one performances of five works; the season of 1896-97, with a precisely similar record; the season of 1901-02, when eight of Wagner's works yielded sixteen performances; and the season of 1902-03, when the same number of works had twenty-six performances. We need not carry the comparison further to show the degree to which Mr. de Koven has been betrayed by a too hasty or too casual assumption. The stubborn and inconvenient fact remains that Wagner was not less, but more, frequently performed in New York during the recent season than in many other seasons of the past. And these additional facts emerge: of the fifteen composers represented at the Metropolitan during the season of 1907-08, Wagner, in respect of numerical preponderance, heads the list, his nearest rivals

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being Verdi and Puccini, each of whom totalled twenty-three performances of four operas. These facts are, it is true, deceptive as indexes of popularity, for the attractive or unattractive manner in which an opera is cast is, obviously, a factor which has to be very gravely reckoned with; they are recited here only because Mr. de Koven invites their exhibition.

Let us pass, then, to the succeeding portion of his testimony. Not only, says Mr. de Koven, has New York "never known a season when fewer of Wagner's works have been performed" (an assertion which we have seen to be in singular conflict with the facts), but there has never been a season "when performances of these works have aroused so little popular interest, or enlisted so scant a measure of popular support." Here Mr. de Koven is upon securer ground. It is undeniable that the Wagner performances at the Metropolitan last season were not so largely attended as they have been in previous years; yet one may be pardoned for believing that the reasons for this are not precisely those advanced by Mr. de Koven, and that they do not indicate so mournful a destiny as that imagined by our prophet of little faith: a time when, as he predicts, "the 'Music of the Future' may have become the 'Music of the Past.'"

Mr. de Koven would have us seek the reasons for the condition which he describes in three directions: "in the inherent character of the works themselves; behind the curtain among the singers; and in front of it among the audience." Mr. de Koven presents these reasons in reverse order. As regards the attitude of the public, he believes that their supposedly weakened allegiance to Wagner is due in part to the disappearance of the Wagnerites, and in part to the competing attractiveness of "the music of more modern composers who have out-Wagnered Wagner," and "have weaned away many admirers . . . in giving them newer, bolder and more vivid musical sensations." As regards conditions "behind the curtain," he holds that there are to-day no "great" Wagner singers, and that the "inferior" ones we do possess "struggle as best they may with . . . well-nigh impossible vocal conditions, or, as is now often the case, refuse these conditions altogether and decline to sing Wagner's music at all"; here Mr. de Koven is obsessed, of course, by the familiar delusion that Wagner's music is "ruinous for the voice." His third contention pertains to "the inherent character of Wagner's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art and his theories of it as exemplified in his operas and music-dramas"; but to this matter we shall come later on.

Mr. de Koven's explanations are not, as has already been remarked, completely persuasive. We may consider first those which are least plausible. As to the present lack of "great" Wagner singers: Let it be regretfully conceded that there is to-day no one familiar to the American stage capable of singing *Tristan* as Jean de Reszke used to sing the part; that there is as yet no successor to Lilli Lehmann. But to hold that there are to-day no Wagner singers of the first rank (the epithet "great" is not to be lightly applied) is to do flagrant injustice to more than a few extraordinarily fine artists. Does Mr. de Koven believe, for example, that the superb and engrossing *Kundry,* the magnetic *Isolde,* the alluring and splendid *Venus,* the insurpassable *Sieglinde,* of Mme. Fremstad are negligible achievements? Have *Wotan, Amfortas, Kurwenal, Wolfram,* been more impressively done than by Mr. Van Rooy? Would he maintain that Wagner has been, on the whole, less admirably sung in our day by Fremstad, Gadski, Ternina, Schumann-Heink, Homer, Van Rooy, Knote, than he was twenty years ago by Niemann, Alvary, Reichmann, Fischer, Brandt, Seidl-Krauss (the incomparable Lehmann is not to be named in any such general parallel)? Probably not. For it is a matter of fairly general agreement among those who are able to judge of the matter that the average of excellence in individual performances of Wagner is higher to-day than it was in the years when the later music-dramas were first revealed to us by singing-actors whose zeal and earnestness were as indisputable as their art was rude and inept.

Again, one must differ with Mr. de Koven when he attributes the alleged abatement of Wagnerian enthusiasm to the weaning away of many of his former admirers by "more modern composers who have out-Wagnered Wagner in giving them newer, bolder and more vivid musical sensations." Who, one wonders, are these composers? It is not easy to think of any modern composers of opera, known to America, who are writing "newer, bolder and more vivid" music than Wagner's except Claude Debussy and Richard Strauss; and the "Pelléas et Mélisande" of Debussy was unknown in this country until late in the past winter, while the "Salome" of Strauss is as yet scarcely known

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here save to students and professional observers. Is Mr. de Koven thinking of Puccini, Leoncavallo, Mascagni? These are makers of music which might perhaps be characterized as "newer" than Wagner's; but "bolder"? "more vivid"? Yet Mr. de Koven has here almost stumbled upon the *crux* of the matter. It is true that Wagner's kingdom, wherein he ruled in solitary magnificence, has been invaded, and by none other than Puccini and his fellows; but it is not, one need scarcely say, any musical superiority which equipped them for that feat.

Mr. de Koven seems to feel that if the purely musical element in Wagner's stage works were more paramount and more appealing, if they possessed what he calls "more formal, salient, fluent melody," their present situation might be different. And in this he is in accord with Mr. Baughn, who blames Wagner because he did not make use of "the full resources of music and of the beautiful singing-voice in duets, concerted numbers and choruses." On the contrary, it is because Wagner was too opulently musical, because he was not Wagnerian enough, not really a faithful executant of his theories, that it is possible to find in his works to-day not only a lack of complete artistic success, but a substantial reason for a measurable slackening of his hold upon the public. He conceived himself to be primarily a dramatist, a dramatist using music solely and frankly as an auxiliary, as a means of intensifying the action and the moods of the play; and this end he pathetically imagined that he had achieved. Had any temerarious soul assured him that his dramas would survive and endure by virtue of their music alone, it is easy to fancy his mingled incredulity and anger. He was not, judged by an ideal even less uncompromising than his own, a musical dramatist at all: he was essentially—as the present deponent ventured to remark in these pages six years ago — a dramatic symphonist, a writer of programme-music who used the drama and its appurtenances, for the most part, as a mere stalking-horse for his huge and intricate and subtle orchestral tone-poems. He was seduced and overwhelmed by his own great and marvellous art, his irrepressible eloquence: his drama is distorted, exaggerated or spread to an arid thinness, to accommodate his imperious musical imagination. He called his operas by the proud title of "music-dramas"; yet often it is impossible to find the drama because of the music. He ruthlessly in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terrupts or suspends the action of his plays or the dialogue of his personages in order that he may meditate or philosophize orchestrally; and in much of the vocal writing in his later works, dramatic consistency and truth are as unconcernedly sacrificed to the opportunity of writing triumphantly beautiful music as they are in any of the unregenerate operas which he despised. It was not, as has been said before, that he fell short, but that he went too far: he should have stopped at eloquent and pointed intensification. Instead, he smothered his none too lucid dramas in a welter of magnificent and inspired music—obscured them, stretched them to intolerable lengths, filled up every possible space in them with his wonderful tonal commentary, by which they are not, as he thought, upborne, but calamitously overweighted. He himself was one of the most formidable enemies that Wagnerism ever had. No principle of musico-dramatic construction was held by him to be more important than that the words uttered by his characters should be clearly understood. "I strove," he wrote, "to raise the dramatic dialogue itself to the main subject of musical treatment"; yet that was precisely what, in many cases, he failed to do: his vocal speech is contrived with skill and cunning, but it has to pierce through a dense orchestral web of many and rich strands, and its mere dramatic significance is frequently obscured in the process. A compromising attitude toward the orchestral commentary on the part of the conductor may do much toward bringing about a juster balance between the musical and dramatic elements; but this is often effected at the expense of much that is characteristic and essential in the quality of the music—as witness the singularly flaccid and ineffectual performance of the "Liebestod" which resulted last winter at the Metropolitan from Mr. Gustav Mahler's commendable desire to bring the words and the song of the transfigured *Isolde* into due prominence.

The effect of all this is lamentable. In the days when the impetus of a pristine enthusiasm drove the more intelligent order of opera-goers to performances of Wagner, it was a labor of love to read in advance the texts of his dramas; and even the guide-books, which were as leaves in Vallombrosa, were prayerfully studied. But to-day, as Mr. de Koven truthfully observes, there are no Wagnerites. We are no longer impelled by an apostolic fervor to delve curiously into the complex genealogy and elaborate ethics

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the "Ring," and it is no longer quite clear to many slothful intelligences just what Tristan and Isolde are talking about in the dusk of King Mark's garden. There will always be a small group of the faithful who, through invincible and loving study, will have learned by heart every secret of these dramas. But for the casual opera-goer, granting him all possible intelligence and intellectual curiosity, they cannot but seem the reverse of crystal-clear, logical and compact.

A score of years ago in New York those who cared at all for the dramatic element in opera, and the measure of whose delight was not filled up by the vocal pyrotechny which was the mainstay of the operas of the older répertoire, found their chief solace and satisfaction in the music-dramas of Wagner. He reigned then virtually alone over his kingdom. The dignity, the imaginative power and the impressive emotional sweep of his dramas, as dramas, offset their obscurity and their inordinate bulk; and always their splendid investiture of music exerted, in and of itself, an enthralling fascination. And that condition of affairs might have continued for much longer had not certain impetuous young men of modern Italy demonstrated the possibility of writing operas which were both dramatically engrossing and musically eloquent, and which had the incalculable merit, for our time and environment, of being both swift in movement and unimpeachably obvious in meaning. Thereupon began the reign of young Italy in contemporary opera. It was inaugurated with the "Cavalleria Rusticana" of Mascagni and the "I Pagliacci" of Leoncavallo; and it is continued to-day, with immense vigor and persistence, by Puccini with all his later works. The sway of the composer of "Madame Butterfly" is triumphant and well-nigh absolute; and the reasons for it are not elusive. He has selected for musical treatment dramas that are terse and rapid in action and intelligible in detail, and he has underscored them with music that is impassioned, incisive, highly spiced, rhetorical, sometimes poetic and ingenious, and pervadingly sentimental. Moreover, he possesses, as his most prosperous attribute, that facility in writing fervid and banal melodies which, as Mr. Henry T. Finck has observed, "give the singers opportunity to pour out their voices in that lavish volume and intensity which provoke applause as infallibly as horseradish provokes tears."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus we find the public offered, on the one hand, the rapidly moving, easily intelligible, and passionate music-dramas of Puccini and his kin (which do not depend for their appeal, let it be noted, upon the popularity of the singers who appear in them); and, on the other hand, the delight of witnessing the vocal necromancy whereby such gifted singers as Mr. Caruso, Mr. Bonci, and Mme. Sembrich have succeeded in galvanizing the obsolescent works of the old school into a semblance of vitality; is it any wonder that, in face of these opposing attractions, the productions of Richard Wagner—which are indubitably not "amusing," as Mr. de Koven sadly observes—should languish in comparative desuetude?

Let us, in conclusion, admit, then, that the general public attitude toward Wagner in New York is at present a little apathetic, by reason, as it seems, of the opposing lures whose nature has been suggested. But that his works will ever suffer any very marked neglect here is not a contingency which need alarm his most timid admirer. The Wagnerites, it is true, are gone; and the validity and persuasiveness of "Tristan" and the "Ring" as dramas seem less certain than of old. But the music lives, as an independent commentary that is of almost universal scope in its voicing of the moods and emotions of men and the varied pageant of the visible world. As music, it is still, at its best, unparalleled and unapproached; and, as Pater prophesied of the poetry of Rossetti, more torches will be lit from its flame than even enthusiasts imagine. Nothing can ever dim the glory of Wagner the weaver of tones. His place is secure among the Olympians; where he sits, one likes to fancy, apart—a little lonely and disdainful. His music is both gorgeous and exquisite, epical and tender, sublimely noble, and human as passion and despair. One can at the least think of him as the subtle observer whom I have just quoted chose to think of a master of poetry: "as a superb god of art, so proudly heedless or reckless that he never notices the loss of his winged sandals, and that he is stumbling clumsily when he might well lightly be lifting his steps against the sunway where his eyes are set."

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GROVER CLEVELAND.

BY THE EDITOR.

In contrast with nearly all the American public men of his time was Grover Cleveland; indeed, it is the exact truth that, in his official conduct, in his public utterances, in his career, he presented to the country its present standard of excellence for the measurement of republican statesmanship,—a standard of which all our active public men fall short, and to which hardly any of them seek to attain.

Great Presidents have been very few; the reasons for this are many, and some of them are obvious. The President of the United States has more power than the English monarch; and, in times when vigorous and quick action is needed, he has more than the British Prime Minister. But the American Executive cannot manifest greatness unless the times and their circumstances require unusual action. It does not follow that a man who, in his age, may be accounted great is recognized necessarily, if he be chosen to the office, to be a great President. The times may not permit; the opportunity may not present itself; the conditions of the country may be so satisfying, so conducive to general contentment that a great man may only manifest his greatness by a wise inactivity. A foolish man in such a place at such a time would disturb the peace and the happiness of the country, because his emotions would lead him to think that he must vindicate his right to supremacy by doing something. Now, to do something merely for the sake of action—to do something when repose is essential—is not to vindicate a right to supremacy, but to demonstrate the gift of inferiority. The still-sitting soul is sublime; but the whirling and whirring fancy is ludicrous weakness, so long as it is not injurious.

The great Presidents whom we have happily possessed may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be easily counted. George Washington was great as a man and a soldier and a statesman. We owe to him, far above all other men, the independence of the country and the Union of the States. Thomas Jefferson was great as political philosopher and as statesman. We owe to him our early teachings of the dignity and worth of manhood, and of the deep significance of the essential principles of individual liberty; and we owe to him our Western boundaries. Abraham Lincoln was a great President. He saved the Union, partly by his splendid patience in dealing with its open enemies, his faith in his cause, and in the people, both Northern and Southern, and partly by his self-sacrificing and very intelligent resistance to the radicals of his own party. Had he lived, the Republic would have been better off to-day than it is likely to be for many years to come. Grover Cleveland is also to be counted a great President, great especially in character. The alternative was more than once presented to him to prefer his party or to defend and protect the general welfare, and he did what is done by all men who are worthy of political leadership; he accepted the issue as it was presented to him, and chose his part without considering his own fortunes; he did what was best for the country and what would, therefore, have been best for his party also if the party had been endowed with the wisdom to accept his reasoned conclusions.

Mr. Cleveland was a great Executive. He asserted and maintained the independence and the dignity of the Presidency against the attacks of the Senate, the enmity of disappointed politicians, the wiles of his own fellow partisans. He enforced the law without prejudice and without favor. He exercised power to maintain Federal rights, and he protected the rights of the States. Without an army and without a competent navy he gained the national purpose against the will of a Power which had successfully declined to yield to the prayers of many administrations before his.

It was a great political career; it is one more testimony to what is really a maxim of the art of government; no man can be a successful statesman who, at any critical moment, will consider the exigencies of his party to the detriment of the public interests. It may be said that his party's judgment of what is best for the public interests is more likely to be correct than his own. This probably will always be untrue; for the party's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

view, especially in emergencies arising from new conditions, will necessarily be a compromise. While it is a common and, on the whole, a true saying that free government, such as our own and such as England's, is government by compromise, there come times when compromise is inevitably wrong, even immoral, and then the public good depends upon the firm conscience and the high courage of the man who will not compromise. The man who then consults his party may be a clever politician whose cleverness may serve him throughout his time; but he will not rank high among statesmen, and what fame he gains will be greatest among his contemporaries.

The first reason for recognizing Cleveland as the man who set up the present standard of excellence in American political life is that he never sought an office; that he never considered his own interests in any political action he took, or in any word he uttered; that, strong partisan as he always was, he regarded his party as an instrument for advancing the public welfare, or for defending or maintaining free government; and that he invariably took office—sometimes at what seemed to him to be a grievous personal sacrifice—for the reason that he was called upon to render service, the highest service of citizenship. The honors and trappings of office were nothing to him; perhaps they and their symbolism were the most grievous burden of his public life; the obligations and duties of office were everything to him. Public life was hard and exacting to him, as it must be to every one whose public work is beneficent.

When he was in the court-room engaged in the trial of a case, he was told that he had been nominated to be Mayor of Buffalo. He had no desire to hold the office; he had never thought that he should be called to it; he was daily becoming more and more interested in his increasing practice; but, as he said in accepting the Democratic nomination for the office, he felt he had no right to consult his own inclination when his fellow citizens called upon him to render a public service. The service, in this instance, was to aid by leading the "efforts to inaugurate a better rule in municipal affairs." The spontaneous response of the people to unselfish devotion to public duty is an answer to the critics of democracy. Cleveland's reputation as a very intelligent, very honest and very effective municipal chief magistrate was so wide and so convincing that Buffalo's Mayor was honored

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

throughout the country, and even in this comparatively humble office he made his name one to conjure with.

It was natural that his party should think of him as an "available" candidate for Governor. It is one of the developed facts of the history of democracy that the possession of character is the most important element of "availability." Cleveland's character induced, perhaps compelled, every nomination that he received from the politicians, and led to every one of his popular majorities; while it was his character which gave him in his retirement the great influence he possessed with the people of the country—the people of all parties and of all sections. So distinguished was his position that to question it or him, its appropriateness or his desert, would have been to create a suspicion of the soundness of the character, or of the sanity of the judgment, of the questioner. The professions made by Cleveland of high ideals of service, and his promises to subordinate personal inclinations and pure partisanship to the good of the community, sound perhaps familiar to those who are acquainted with the words and the ways of the usual politician, the words of promise and the ways of negation. Cleveland, in our expressive phrase, "made good"; it was soon learned that he never had intention to utter empty words, or to lure votes for himself by jingling the small counterfeit coin of speeches and letters of acceptance, as well as of platforms, that has now jingled so often that its meretricious tintinnabulations never penetrate beyond the portal of the public ear. He seemed a new kind of politician in those early days. His official life was on the high plane of his utterances. Many men before him had prattled about service, but he served, not grudgingly, not fitfully; he never spared himself. He was literally the servant of the people whose officer he was. It was their government that he administered, their property that he cared for, their offices that he filled, and their good that he consulted.

When his friends told him that they thought he ought to be nominated for Governor he was not patient, and some said that he was petulantly impatient, while some regarded him as rude. A good many people have thought Cleveland rude first and last, but most of the time the seeming rudeness could be traced to preoccupation. He had now become engrossed in the concerns of a city. These concerns were sadly disarranged when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he became Mayor, and in a few months he had done much to put them in order; so much had he accomplished that the corrupt leeches on the body politic were shaken off their prey, and were as angry against the Mayor as good citizens were pleased with him. He resented the attempt to take him from what had now become an absorbing occupation, but the party prevailed. It had been wise enough to seize its opportunity, and its candidate was made Governor of the State. In about two years he was again taken from an office in which he was rendering public service, and was nominated to be President of the United States.

It is one of the significant facts in Cleveland's public life that he deeply offended every plundering politician with whom he came in contact, or with whose plans and political occupations, directly or indirectly, he interfered. When he was Mayor of Buffalo he put an end to the usual easy stealing which makes city politics so tempting a field to those who seek office for the customary purpose of serving themselves and those of their friends and acquaintances who keep them in power. Cleveland had no fear of these offended persons because he had nothing to ask of them. Nor did he have the politician's fear of offending public clamor. He was a just man, and executed the law as it was written and as was its intent. So he vetoed the "Elevated Railroad Five-Cent Bill," thereby raising a windy storm of angry and menacing words which passed on, in time, into generous praise for a manly discharge of a plain duty. The Congressman who gains his poor place in public life by catering to the selfishness of his constituents encountered him after he became President. The men who sought votes through the distribution of seed to "drought-stricken" farmers at the expense of the Federal Government were startled by the President's refusal to violate the law in their behalf; the practice of raiding the Treasury for pensions in aid of those who were not entitled to them under general laws, or who were not entitled to them at all because their claims were fraudulent, was long a source of large profit to pension agents and to politicians; Cleveland made no friends of these by his many vetoes of this scandalous legislation. The party managers who desired the distribution of the public offices for the profit of parties and partisans soon found that Cleveland's devotion to the public interests was incompatible with their designs.

The public man of the United States who, like Cleveland,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administers the public law for the public welfare is not generally counted a good politician. Carl Schurz used to say that such a man was the best of politicians. What is meant here by the "good politician" is the man who can win most votes at the polls. The narrow-visioned, unimaginative, unobservant politician is wrong, and Carl Schurz was right. Sometimes the time-server is forced to recognize the truth and to nominate the man of the first rank, whom, however, sooner or later, he will have at the mercy of his petty wrath and small opinion. In the main, the politician will refuse to nominate the large man, thus denying to the country the opportunity to express its opinion of him; it remains true, nevertheless, that the public servant who devotes himself to the public good in this country will always command the public respect and affection. To fill office and to perform its functions in this way, with the self-sacrifice which this way demands, is to be a statesman. To do this consistently and persistently is to make one's career a standard of statesmanship. And this Cleveland accomplished. In his active official life every moment was the city's or the State's or the Nation's. All his thoughts and deeds were for those for whom he was trustee. He lived up to his ideal with a courage and a devotion that made him in his retirement the most influential citizen of the country. When he held office he more than once refused to sacrifice what he esteemed to be the good of the country to party harmony, to party gain or to personal advantage. He defended the country against the selfishness and greed of politicians and of other dealers in public wares. He defended, too, against the Senate, the office which had been bestowed upon him, as he defended Federal rights against the States, as he was circumspectly jealous of the rights of the States. He could not be moved, as other men, some of them good, have been, by temptations presented to his ambition, for he had no ambition to hold office or to wield power. "What can you do with such a man?" asked some one; "he doesn't want anything." The public life of Grover Cleveland was one of service, and from it grew his wonderful influence. He was the pre-eminent embodiment of these political and social truths—that from the truest service comes the noblest power, and that the power of influence is vastly greater than the power of authority.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR AND CHARLES JOHNSTON.

"ROSE MACLEOD."*

It almost seems as if there must be something suddenly and monstrously wrong with the young women of America when they can suggest, within a few months, two such closely similar types as Miss Anne Douglas Sedgwick's *Imogen* in her "A Fountain Sealed" and the somewhat more dispassionately presented *Electra* in Miss Alice Brown's "Rose MacLeod." For the dismaying feature of these two unlovely characters is their air of having been zealously studied from life. The reader is obliged to conclude that there must exist, in ripe perfection, the type that both these accomplished novelists have chosen to reveal,—the cold-blooded, strong-willed young egotist with an undigested education who is no less of a bore because she is elaborately enlightened and no less inhuman because she professes so stern a devotion to the abstract virtues. "You're not clever," Electra is at one point spiritedly reminded. "There's no need of your being. But you've made yourself so intelligent that you're as dull as death. You've cultivated your talents till you've snapped them all in two. You've tried so hard to be a model of conduct that you're a horror, a positive horror." Artistically such a type does not arouse deep interest because it admits of but a single bald interpretation. Almost any reader would declare at once that it was fundamentally objectionable and silently pray that he might not encounter its original. It is the sociological aspect of the case, however, that is agitating. Is there to be a plague of Imogens and Electras, and what conditions produce them? Miss

* "Rose MacLeod." By Alice Brown. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sedgwick hints delicately of colleges and Miss Brown of women's clubs, but it would manifestly be unfair to hold either of these institutions fully responsible. If there is a problem contained here, it is so far an utterly unillumined one.

It will be remembered that Miss Sedgwick's young woman had a convenient object of discipline in her charming mother, but Electra Fulton, whether or not because her parents succumbed early to her own youthful severities, is an orphan, her only immediate victim being an entertaining and unregenerate grandmother. Of course everybody knows that this is the age of grandmothers and one expects them to be pompadoured rather than lace-capped, and flippant rather than benevolent. But the distinguishing exploit of Electra's grandmother is one that during the serial publication of "Rose MacLeod" the reading world has accepted with singular calmness. Being in need of money, and also, as she says, of "fun," this daring and ingenious old lady accepted a publisher's offer to write her "recollections," her husband having been a learned man and her life passed in Cambridge and Boston. This volume, made up of invented letters and concocted reminiscences, was a prompt success, and its author received and spent her profits with great relish. Her unrepentant attitude is very engaging. "'For Heaven's sake, Electra,' she fulminated, 'what is there so sacred about Brook Farm? If anybody is going to make up letters from anywhere, why shouldn't it be from there?'" It is a distinct triumph of Miss Brown's that one finds oneself willing to accept all the old lady's amusing naughtinesses. But as to the success of her bit of bravado—are publishers and public and critics so easily imposed upon as this lightly related episode would imply? The guardians of the integrity of literature have at all events not sprung to their own defence.

But, after all, this is called a novel about Rose MacLeod. One finds oneself wondering why one encounters so many delays in arriving at a discussion of the heroine. It may always be more or less of a misfortune to be a heroine; at all events, Rose MacLeod suffers particularly from this enforced prominence. One would like her so much better if it were not for the uncomfortable feeling that one ought to take her more seriously than one can. After recklessly endowing her with "the most beautiful hair in Europe," Miss Brown transports Rose to suburban Boston in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most ingloriously passive rôle. She is a pleasant but inconceivably limp young creature who serves, however, as a foil to Electra's more vigorously conceived unpleasantness, and as an illustration also of the paternal policy of that very well presented demagogue, Markham MacLeod. Perhaps the most masterly touches in the book are expended upon this portrait of the "Chief" of the universal "Brotherhood," whose despotic power over its members extended to the matter of life and death—Miss Brown is perhaps a little afraid of the darker aspects of this portion of her material—who won power by his robust physical magnetism and who "offered commonplaces in a rich voice that made them memorable." Miss Brown has been successful with this character to the point that one forgets all about Rose when he is on the stage; and one has to force oneself to remember that the interest of the book is probably intended to centre in Rose MacLeod's love-story,—which is less a story, however, than a succession of graceful scenes and which keeps the reader at a comfortable and unagitating distance from life. It is as though one learned of Rose's experiences at second or third hand,—one is not intimately moved by them. The romantic interest of the book is throughout rather cool and thin, and of far less rich and satisfying quality than its comedy,—than the fantastically conceived relation between Electra and her grandmother, or than the irrepressible old lady's passages with her elderly lover whom she whimsically engages herself to marry merely by way of offsetting her granddaughter's ostentatious virtues and proprieties. "You can't mean—grandmother, are you going to marry him?" Electra asked. "Not at once," the old lady replied. "I expect to have a good many little affairs before I settle down."

A fact that rather sets Miss Brown's book apart from most novels of equal merit is that apart from the distressing problem of the Electras of society, already referred to, and the introduction of the "Brotherhood," the story is simply a story and is concerned with no special theme or condition. Yet the book has the appearance of a very ambitious undertaking because its group of characters are differentiated and individualized with such excessive care. Peter, the artist lover of whom a cruelly prompt justice deprives the priggish Electra; Osmond, the crippled hermit; Billy Stark, the amiable little man of the world, are all energetically imagined and, by the exercise of an unusually

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strong dramatic sense, skilfully related. And these characters are probably no less effective because they are obviously the creations of a feminine mind. Women have perhaps been rather too much praised for writing books that sound as though a man had written them. It is never the least interesting feature of Miss Brown's work that her stories unmistakably reflect a woman's view of the world.

OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER.*

ONE reads a book like this with regret and misgiving. Not only is one forced to disagree with very much that it contains, but one is also compelled to think that it will inevitably cast a shadow on Mr. Campbell's earlier work, with its very genuine liberalism and spirituality, and will furnish a weapon to the forces of dogmatism and reaction, which will be used with vigor and effect. In his earlier work, Mr. Campbell again and again insisted that spiritual well-being, spiritual life, all that is meant by "salvation," depends not so much on verbal and mental assent to certain formulas, as on inward spiritual awakening, growth in spiritual life and a gradual raising of the interior consciousness until it reaches and becomes one with the divine consciousness; that thus through "the new birth from above," the spiritual man comes into being, and that this spiritual man is of his own nature, or rather through his sharing in the divine nature, immortal, a habitant of eternity; in a word, the mystical teaching of the saints in all ages.

It would seem that Mr. Campbell has lacked something of the courage and aspiration needed for further spiritual growth; that he has drawn back, appalled by the silence and darkness of the invisible worlds: that initial darkness to which all saints have borne witness; and that he has sought refuge in a materialism, which is all the more to be regretted because it is covered up by the phrases and emotions of idealism. He no longer finds true spiritual well-being in the development of spiritual life and the spiritual man, the present immortal; but rather in a purely material security, whose merely sensuous appeal is veiled by the assurance that something great and beautiful is being sought for

* "Christianity and the Social Order." By Rev. R. J. Campbell. New York: The Macmillan Co

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all mankind. As if what is undeniably injurious for one becomes less so when it is shared among all. And no one with a broad view of history and religion can deny that to set the affections on things of earth is injurious, whether for one or for many.

But it is not the earthward tendency of this new book which is its most regrettable feature. After all, hedonism, whether frank or sentimental, has never lacked its prophets. What is to be regretted, and deeply regretted, is the fact that Mr. Campbell has tried to bring down to the level of his hedonism the Founder of Christianity and the whole teaching of the Apostles. This attempt fills the first part of the work, and it is this part which is likely to be decisive in giving the book its final place.

Mr. Campbell's critical procedure is at least simple. He wishes to show that Jesus taught primarily the establishment of an earthly kingdom. He finds obstacles to this view in all the purely spiritual teaching, which is most characteristic of the Master, the teaching, for instance, as it was understood and set forth by the beloved disciple. Therefore Mr. Campbell decides to discard the Fourth Gospel as an historic record, and simply rules St. John out of court. But there is a growing opinion among the most enlightened students of the Christian documents that not only is the Fourth Gospel not what Mr. Campbell assumes it to be, a religious romance of late date, but that it is, in part at least, the oldest and earliest document in the New Testament; the first-hand evidence of the beloved disciple himself, written within a short time, perhaps a few weeks, after the Crucifixion. Two-thirds of the Fourth Gospel refer to the last few weeks of the life of Jesus, and one-third refers to the last twenty-four hours before the Crucifixion. And this whole part has a freshness, a minuteness of detail, a directness, which speak of a record made at the time of the events themselves, or immediately after. It is possible that the opening chapters were written many years later, and it is certain that the whole was gone over, very probably by John himself, then an old man, who added notes to make certain Jewish customs more intelligible for non-Jews, probably the disciples of his church of Smyrna; and it is these notes which have been used to throw doubt on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But we must remember that this too sceptical criticism was simply the reaction from a too emphatic dogmatism, and is now giving way to much more conservative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

views. There is little doubt that before long John will be universally recognized as the author of the Fourth Gospel, and that the greater part of it was written very soon after the events of which it gives such a living record. And with John's record thus established, as a first-hand account of the life and teaching of the Master, the spiritual nature of the Master's message will come out clear and inspiring, and it will become increasingly difficult for any one to assert that Jesus sought primarily to establish a reign of material well-being on earth, as Mr. Campbell would have us believe. It is hardly necessary to criticise his views of the Apostolic age, and particularly of Paul. We may content ourselves by letting Paul speak for himself, as he does in two of the "uncontested and incontestable" epistles. His phrases are at once quaintly characteristic and drastic, and give little countenance to the new sentimental hedonism. The first sentence is this: "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them." The second phrase goes farther, and is more constructive: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *June, 1908.*

QUESTIONS of foreign policy have more than held their own during the last few weeks in interest and importance against the competition of domestic events. The visit of M. Fallières to London in the last week of May—one of the most successful and enjoyable visits, I should judge, ever paid by the head of one state to the ruler and the people of another—was something more than a ceremonial exchange of courtesies. It was a political demonstration of real and deep significance. It coincided, moreover, with an announcement even more auspicious and momentous, the announcement that King Edward, for the first time since his accession, was about to visit the Tsar of Russia. Two such events, so closely connected not only in time, but in the weightier relationship of political cause and consequence, greatly moved and impressed England, and indeed all Europe, and started a discussion on the aims and possibilities of British foreign policy that is raging, as I write, from the Thames to the Neva.

It may, perhaps, be useful to American readers if I recall very briefly the history of the Anglo-French *entente*. It was born of the union of three streams of tendencies: (1) Of the reaction in England against the Philo-Germanism of British foreign policy; (2) of the desire of France to simplify and co-ordinate her external interests; and (3) of an accession of weariness and disgust among the French and British peoples with the furious scoldings and recriminations of Fashoda, the Dreyfus case and the Boer war. Almost up to the moment of the Kaiser's telegram to President Krüger, Great Britain, as between the Dual and the Triple Alliance, had tended rather to side with the latter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

She was at loggerheads with both France and Russia; she was on terms of friendship, though a somewhat cooling friendship, with Germany. I need not now detail the various incidents and influences that in the last twelve years have gradually changed both the popular and the official attitude of this country towards Germany. It is enough that the change took place—it reached, perhaps, its acme in the national outburst of wrath over the Anglo-German compact for the coercion of Venezuela—and that it was automatically accompanied by a corresponding improvement in Anglo-French relations. On both sides of the Channel, there was a simultaneous movement towards a better understanding. It became a fixed point in M. Delcassé's policy to work for a *rapprochement* with Great Britain. He saw that France could not afford two first-class hatreds; that she could not be at one and the same time anti-German and anti-British; that she could not simultaneously oppose the strongest military and the strongest naval Power in the world. He decided that the haphazard and provocative policy which brought England and France face to face at more than one perilous point, which dissipated instead of consolidating the strength of his country and which seduced France from what must always be her paramount objective, was really risking more than the game was worth. He therefore made up his mind to abandon it.

In this determination he was greatly aided by two factors. One was the accession to the British throne of a sovereign whom all Frenchmen knew and liked, and who speedily made it his business to further the gathering impulse towards confidence and good-will. The other was a sense of shame that had come over the British and French peoples when they reviewed their mutual cannonade of abuse and began to appreciate the essentially insignificant nature of most of their disputes. It was in these circumstances that the Anglo-French Agreement of 1904 was negotiated. It was at first a purely Colonial compact. But events quickly expanded its scope and gave to the new-born friendship it embodied a European importance and application. The *entente* served to draw a ring round the combatants in the Far East; it furnished a round-table at which both Great Britain and France could meet for the settlement of the North Sea incident; and under the impact of the Kaiser's visit to Tangier and of the exciting months that preceded and followed the sum-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moning of the Algeciras Conference, it developed into one of the mainstays of the European equilibrium, and virtually bound France and Great Britain together in a defensive alliance. It has produced other results besides these. It has rescued Great Britain from an isolation that was becoming perilous. It has made it possible for France to concentrate all her strength on a single point. It has proved a platform on which Great Britain and Russia, and France and Japan, have been able to meet for purposes of friendly accommodation; and it has been the means of bringing all the Mediterranean Powers together in the adjustment of their common interests.

These are very great achievements. But do they exhaust the possibilities of the *entente?* In the enthusiasm evoked by the visit of President Fallières to London, a considerable body of opinion was revealed on either side of the Channel in favor, not merely of maintaining the *entente,* but of expanding it, of converting it, in fact, into a formal alliance. There is something to be said for such a course; but, on the whole, the best opinion both in England and in France seems agreed that there is more to be said against it. The indefiniteness that obtains as to the precise political obligations involved in the *entente* is urged as a reason for clearing up all uncertainty. If, it is said, Great Britain has made up her mind that the security and independence of France are British interests, if she is prepared to join with France in resisting an unprovoked attack, would it not be better to say so openly? A public compact binding Great Britain and France to stand together in opposing an aggressive onslaught would, it is argued, be the most effective means of preventing such an onslaught from being delivered; and by supplementing the Dual Alliance, by forming what would practically be a new Triplice, it would enormously reinforce the guarantees of peace. On the other hand, the "*Temps,*" which is always in close touch with the Quai d'Orsay, gave a new turn to the discussion by bluntly saying that an Anglo-French alliance, though very desirable, was out of the question so long as the British army remained a negligible quantity. It is unquestionably the fact that Great Britain is less capable of taking part in Continental warfare to-day than at any moment of her history. Only the adoption of some form of compulsory and universal military service could enable her to duplicate the phe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomenal efforts she put forth and the successes she achieved in the Napoleonic wars. But not even for the agreeable prospect of an Anglo-French Alliance is Great Britain prepared to maintain not only the overwhelming navy called for by her insular position, not only a professional and very expensive army for the defence of the Empire, but also a system of universal service for a possible Continental war. If, therefore, the views of the "*Temps*" correctly represent the views of those in authority in France, British opinion reluctantly concludes that the price of an alliance comes too high, and would prefer in consequence that things should remain as they are. It would not, however, be difficult to show that the "*Temps*" has taken a too exclusively military, and therefore incomplete, view of the situation, and that Great Britain, without increasing her present army, could co-operate with France with an effectiveness that even in a vast Continental struggle might well prove decisive.

It is, at any rate, a piquant and momentous development in European politics that the idea of an Anglo-French Alliance should no longer be dismissed as something flatly incredible, but should be backed by a substantial minority in both countries without arousing the opposition of the still unconverted majority. The importance of that fact is confirmed and emphasized by the increasing friendliness of Anglo-Russian relations. King Edward's visit to the Tsar had, indeed, an even greater significance than the French President's triumphant descent upon London. It was in a sense a ratification both of the Peace of Portsmouth and of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. It was a proof that Russia, for the moment at all events, acquiesces in the results of her struggle with Japan and in the new political dispensation that has been established in the Far East. It was a not less emphatic testimony to the improvement which M. Stolypin has brought about in Russia's domestic conditions. It confirmed, again, the *entente* with France, which in British eyes must always remain incomplete so long as Russia, the ally of France, is not included in it. It showed, also, that the Anglo-Russian Agreement of last year, and the policy of friendship with England upon which it was based, have the personal approval and sympathy of the Tsar; and the wishes and sentiments of the Tsar, I need hardly add, are still and will long continue to be a leading, and often a controlling, factor in the guidance of Russia's foreign policy. A section

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of English Radicals objected to the King's visit, and spoke of it as though it were an act of treachery to the cause of freedom. The great bulk of the British people, however, have no sympathy with these views. They wish well for the progress of Russian liberty. They are confident that the influence of so modern and unprejudiced a sovereign as King Edward will be used on the side of appeasement and reconciliation between the Tsar and his people, and should therefore be welcomed by the friends of Russian advancement. The idea of boycotting the Tsar, or of holding him personally responsible for the deeds and policies of the bureaucracy, does not appeal to them. They perceive that the only result of acting upon it would be to thrust the Tsar back into the arms of less enlightened advisers and to encourage all the reactionary elements. Moreover, the British people have awakened to the fact that their long estrangement from Russia has been profitable to neither country. The Morocco episode taught them that it is not a British interest, but the very reverse, that Russia should be weak, disorganized and unable to make her due weight felt in Europe. They are sincerely anxious for better relations with Russia and they welcome every prospect of co-operation between the two countries. They have, therefore, watched with virtually unanimous approval King Edward's efforts to cement the good understanding that now exists between London and St. Petersburg by establishing equally close and confidential relations between himself and the Tsar. Great Britain, France and Russia must from now onwards draw nearer together. The motive that impels them is a motive that has always operated in European history. Whenever a single Power has shown signs of attaining to an unhealthy predominance, the other Powers that feel themselves threatened have invariably combined for purposes of self-defence. It is this, at bottom, that accounts for the Anglo-French *entente,* for the *rapprochement* between England and Russia and for the gradual welding together of all three Powers in an informal Triplice. It is the exact truth to say that it is not a league which is aimed at Germany. But it is also the exact truth to call it a league of mutual insurance against Germany.

In domestic affairs by far the most interesting incident of the last few weeks has been Mr. Asquith's statement on woman suffrage. Answering a deputation, the Prime Minister announced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that, before the next appeal to the country was taken, the Government would introduce and would pass an electoral reform bill; and that if an amendment were proposed in favor of woman suffrage the Government would not oppose it, provided (1) that it was framed upon democratic lines, and (2) that it had behind it "the overwhelming support of the women in the country, no less than the support of the men." The first proviso is taken to mean that no attempt to limit the franchise to women who are possessed of the property qualification will be accepted by the Government. With regard to the second condition, I am bound to say that it lacks the definiteness and practicality of most of Mr. Asquith's utterances. How can any proof be forthcoming that female suffrage has the "overwhelming support" of the women in the country? Who is to determine the comparative strength of those who favor and of those who oppose this vast and revolutionary extension of the suffrage? What machinery is to be set in motion for ascertaining whether more than half the men and women of England desire the political enfranchisement of women? A referendum on the question might furnish a clear answer; but a referendum, though I believe it to be one of the certainties of the future, is a device at present unknown to the British Constitution, and its introduction would be an innovation at least as great as the grant of woman suffrage itself. One may, therefore, discount the second of the provisos laid down by Mr. Asquith. Nobody knows, nobody probably ever will know, nor is there any means of finding out, even the approximate number of men and women who support female suffrage. The question has never been thought out by the country; it has never been presented to the voters as even a prominent issue; it is not a dividing line between the parties; and even the present Government, while professing to regard it with a benevolent neutrality, would not dare to make it a vital part of its programme. Under these circumstances, I do not expect to see woman suffrage, except possibly in an extremely limited degree, granted by this Parliament. The House of Lords will certainly emasculate any amendment to the projected electoral reform bill that is likely to satisfy the suffragists; and the Government, not having proposed the amendment on its own account, but having merely accepted it at second hand, will not, I should think, feel called upon to make it a *casus belli* with the Upper House.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *June, 1908.*

THE struggle for parliamentary government is the main fact of contemporary Russian history; and, during the past three months, it has been waged with a degree of success which cannot be accounted for either by the moderate wisdom of its champions or the utter folly of its adversaries. True, the Parliament has shown unexpected push, the Cabinet has displayed a greater degree of compliance and foresight and the Crown has put forth a more sobering influence upon its friends and foes than most onlookers anticipated.

Besides, whatever happened gave a fillip to the democratic cause. And naturally so, for the current of such public opinion as exists is definitely set against a strong monarchy and in favor of parliamentary government. Moreover, as there is already a Cabinet and a Prime Minister in name, there must in time be a Cabinet and a Prime Minister in reality. At present, in theory the Cabinet wields no power over such important matters as the army, the navy, the conduct of foreign affairs, while the Premier can neither choose his colleagues nor press on his policy if it fail to secure the support of the Crown. But, in point of fact, there is a tendency, obvious and pronounced, among the Ministers outside the Cabinet to take refuge within the fold, now on this pretext, now on that, and to allow the Duma at least a share of their responsibility. Thus the Minister of Foreign Affairs, with the express permission of the Tsar, gracefully submitted his views on the Far East and his policy in Macedonia to the judgment of the Deputies, who rewarded him by approving both. Lastly, it should be said that the absence of certain conditions, which in other countries proved essential to the growth of parliamentary government, is fully compensated in Russia by the short-sightedness, apathy and blunders of the anti-popular party, which calls itself "conservative," yet lacks settled principles, eschews long views and scorns combined action.

Among the more striking illustrations of the ups and downs of the struggle for popular government, the incident of the "Constitutional Rouble" is worthy of note. The estimates of the Railway Minister coming before the Duma the other day, it was resolved that one item of 5,500 dollars, representing the travelling expenses of certain officials, should be struck out. The grounds were conclusive: the scale of travelling expenses for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public servants is still calculated as in olden times when there were no railways. So many dollars are allowed per horse and mile, and the number of horses is determined by the rank of the official—a Councillor of State, for example, having a right to six horses and one carriage, while a Minister, curiously enough, moves about, theoretically, in two troikas. To this extravagant mode of travelling the Duma cried halt, and disallowed 5,500 dollars. The Railway Minister demurred. "You cannot," he said in substance, "cut down my estimates because they were ratified by the Tsar when the Duma was not sitting, and therefore, according to the fundamental laws, the Chamber has no power over them."

A member of the Opposition then arose and joined issue with the Minister. "When you plead the authority of the Tsar," he said, "you are relying not upon the fundamental laws, as you imagine, but upon a breach of those laws. The clause in virtue of which His Majesty intervened does not provide for such intervention at all. True, there is another clause of the fundamental laws in virtue of which His Majesty might have ratified your estimates down to January last, but not beyond that date. But, instead of that, you asked His Majesty to invoke a paragraph that is wholly irrelevant." This contention being unanswerable, the Duma, at the instance of a conservative Deputy, brushed aside the Imperial ukase, struck out the 5,500 dollars and further curtailed the estimates by one rouble — or fifty cents—to show its sense of dissatisfaction at the slovenly way in which the Cabinet had toyed with the Imperial authority and the fundamental laws. But the main point underlined by the press was that the Duma had vindicated its authority as against the alleged authority of the Tsar, and that the initiative was taken by the conservative party.

The delinquencies of the Railway Ministry, which has been peculiarly unfortunate in its dealings with the Duma, provided the occasion for another act by which the Parliament again asserted its rights and extended them. Russian railways, which might be most lucrative enterprises, do not pay: like benevolent institutions, they are run at a loss. A large percentage of passengers bribe the conductors and travel gratis, and syndicates of thieves pay confederates in the service of the railways to falsify receipts and invoices, and then claim compensation for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imaginary losses. One result of these predatory methods is that the greater the traffic on a line, the greater is the cost of carrying it per ton. The Deputies turning these things over in their minds, hit upon the expedient of appointing a commission to overhaul the mechanism of railway administration, to study it on various lines at different times, and then to frame a measure of radical reform.

Again the Minister, von Schaufuss, opposed the motion. "If you wish to make an inquiry, I will help you," he said. "All data in our possession are at your service. Any questions you may put will be answered. But you have no right to go to work independently of my Ministry. Still less may you go about from line to line cross-examining people. In a word, you are not competent to pass a law appointing a parliamentary commission." And truth compels one to add that the Minister was technically right. But the Duma flared up, stigmatized the Railway Department as incapable and, after a lively debate, passed the motion in favor of a parliamentary commission.

One sympathizes with the Duma when it insists on retrenchment whenever retrenchment is not incompatible with a due regard for the pressing needs of the Empire. For the financial condition of Russia is become of primary importance, and will remain so during the next two or three years. In this respect the nation may be likened to a man, once strong, who has undergone three attacks of illness in quick succession—typhus, malaria and inflammation of the lungs—and is now on the way to recovery, but feeling still very weak. He is certain to get back his pristine health and strength—unless he contracts another malady, and in that case his chances of pulling through are infinitesimal. The thrift of the Duma, therefore, is salutary; and, when Deputies inveighed against the mismanagement of the Railways and proposed to appoint a parliamentary commission to ascertain the source of the evil, every friend of Russia applauded. "The Railway Minister ought not to be trusted with the spending even of a thousand roubles without the strictest control," Deputies said. And yet when the Railway Minister asked for a credit of about two hundred million dollars for the construction of a railway parallel to the Amur River, the Duma, asking no questions, made haste to vote the money.

This rash vote may make as much mischief as did the resolve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Tsar's Government to "lease" Port Arthur. Look at it from whatever point of view you like, and you cannot fail to see that it bristles with drawbacks. Politically, it constitutes a provocation to Japan and China; economically and financially, it is a needless weakening of the nation; strategically, it fetters the freedom of action of the army.

The scheme in itself is excellent. To open up vast regions whose mineral wealth is inexhaustible, will in time benefit the poverty-stricken Russian people. Besides, the development of railways and waterways is an essential condition of well-being to an empire which stretches over one-sixth of the globe. Moreover, it would be unwise to leave such great tracts of territory unutilized in face of the millions of Chinese and Japanese who are eager to settle there. These considerations moved the Ministers to take the matter up two years ago, and on June 26th, 1906, they approved the proposal to allot funds for the necessary surveys. The minutes of their discussion being laid before the Tsar, His Majesty wrote on the margin: "It is imperatively necessary to make haste and set about building the railway." Thus the Ministers had had preliminary surveys in view, whereas the Monarch wanted the railway. And the result was that, in virtue of the supreme legislative authority vested in the Tsar when the Duma is not sitting, orders were given that the work of laying the rails should be begun, and it is still going on.

But, sooner or later, the Duma had to be consulted. Shortly afterwards, therefore, a Bill was drawn up enacting that the line be constructed within four years, and that only Russian labor be employed. Of surveys there was no mention, although they are indispensable in a desolate, rugged country about which next to nothing is known. Strategical grounds were pleaded in justification of the haste. It was a question of life and death, the War Minister asserted. The work, he added, must be undertaken at once, and it would have to be completed by 1912, when Japan will have finished her preparations for war. This argument put an aspect on the matter which disconcerted the advocates of peace. Japan and Russia, they had been told, are now friends. That was the object and the effect of the Russo-Japanese Convention. Yet, that being so, whence comes the danger of war? On the other hand, if the misgivings of the War Minister are well grounded, will the Amur Railway effectively dispel them,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and give the nation the security it needs? On this point experts were at variance, some averring that the Amur Railway would once and for all safeguard Russia's Far Eastern possessions, others asserting that it would make little or no difference, while a third group of specialists held that it would deprive the army of its opportunity to choose the battlefield and would therefore help the Japanese. General Kuropatkin, who is still looked up to as an authority in strategic matters, gave it as his opinion that the railway alone would be inadequate for the purpose of defence without other measures. If, in order to defend the Russians in Port Arthur, some strategists reasoned, Kuropatkin had to as an authority in strategic matters, gave it as his opinion Harbin, the Generalissimo in the next war will have to defend the Russian colonists who will have been induced by the Government to settle on the Amur. And this would be disastrous, because the right scheme of defence would be to abandon the Amur region and await the invaders in Transbaikalia.

On the financial aspect of the scheme, great stress was laid by Count Witte, who was the soul of the opposition. He showed that, although one hundred and fifty million dollars was the estimated cost, the total would not be less than two hundred and fifty millions. Then the railway itself would have to be defended and several fortresses built, each of which would cost about one hundred and fifty millions. Barracks, arsenals, stores and troops would necessitate the outlay of as much again. Thus, at a moderate estimate, about six hundred million dollars would be the total of the bill in its final shape. And as the railway would, the Government admitted, have to be run at a loss for several years to come, the financial burden which it would impose on the nation would be extremely irksome.

The Finance Minister in reply to Count Witte's objections promised to provide the sums needed—one hundred and fifty million dollars for the Amur scheme, three hundred millions for the army supplies and two hundred millions for laying down a second track on the Transsiberian Railway. But the conditions he laid down were dismal or fantastic: there must be no supplementary demands; no costly internal reforms must be tackled before the Amur Line is built and paid for; the temporary war-taxes must not be abolished; the new taxes which are now being framed must, with the exception of the income tax, be levied.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In international affairs, Russia's secular aspirations, her traditional aims, throughout the world seem destined, thanks to Germany's opposition, to remain disembodied dreams. Her mission among the Slav subjects of the Sultan is being thwarted by Austria and Germany. Her claim to enter upon the succession of the Turk in Asia Minor is forestalled by the Kaiser, whose Baghdad Railway will in all probability have become a powerful factor in world-politics before the present generation disappears. Her confident hope of absorbing northern Persia is baffled by Wilhelm II, who proclaims himself the ally of Moslems throughout the globe. And if the Tsar's Far Eastern schemes, seemingly well-laid and grandiose, have also been frustrated beyond remedy, Russians fancy they can discern the deliberate cause of that defeat in Berlin. In a word, it looks as though Slav and Teuton have at last met in the struggle for national life or death.

WASHINGTON, *June, 1908.*

THE Republican National Convention was thoroughly organized and steadily controlled by the friends of the Roosevelt Administration. The event fulfilled almost exactly the prediction of Mr. Hitchcock, the Administration's campaign manager, that, on the first ballot, Judge Taft would have more than 700 out of the 980 votes. It is true that the programme, which, so far as the platform and the leading name on the ticket are concerned, was planned in Washington, was threatened with two dangers. In the first place, the Convention might be stampeded for Mr. Roosevelt: in the second place, the conservative element of the party might prove strong enough in the Committee on Resolutions to strike out the anti-injunction plank, fashioned in Washington, in which case an open fight on the floor of the Convention would have followed, and the Radicals, aggrieved by the loss of the anti-injunction plank, might have nominated Mr. Roosevelt. The first danger was shrewdly averted by Senator Lodge, who, in his speech on assuming the function of Permanent Chairman, contrived to uncork the bottled enthusiasm of the "Third-Termers." The second peril was conjured by an agreement between the Conservatives and Radicals in the Committee on Resolutions so to reconstruct the anti-injunction plank as to offer the minimum of concession to the demand of the Labor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unionists. The result was that every effort made on June 18th to stampede the Convention for Mr. Roosevelt miscarried.

The qualifications of William H. Taft for the Presidency may be indicated in a paragraph. He is the son of Alphonso Taft, who, like the present Secretary of War, was a graduate of Yale College, and who was himself at one time Secretary of War, as well as Attorney-General of the United States, a United States Circuit Court Judge, Minister to Austria and Minister to Russia. During the two years following his graduation from Yale, William H. Taft was a reporter for Cincinnati newspapers while preparing himself for the bar. In 1881, he was appointed Assistant Prosecuting Attorney for Hamilton County, Ohio, and, in the following year, he became Collector of Internal Revenue in the First District of his State. In 1887, he became a State Judge, being appointed to the Superior Court bench by Governor Foraker, and in the subsequent year he was elected to succeed himself. This is the only elective office which he has ever held. In 1890 he was appointed by President Harrison Solicitor-General of the United States, a post which he gave up two years later to accept the United States Circuit Judgeship of the Sixth Judicial Circuit, which included his native State. In 1900, President McKinley prevailed upon him to resign his seat on the Federal Bench, in order to become the Chairman of the Philippines Commission. In 1902, he was sent to Rome by President Roosevelt and Secretary of War Root to confer with Pope Leo XIII concerning the agricultural lands of religious orders in the Philippines. In 1904, he was recalled from the archipelago to succeed Mr. Root as Secretary of War. The work which he has since performed in connection with the Panama Canal and with the restoration of order in Cuba is well known.

Such is a naked outline of his public life. But, when we come to the question of his prospect of success, we, naturally, must examine the objections made to him by his opponents. It is urged, in the first place, that the Labor-Unionists will never forgive him for certain decisions which he rendered during his career on the bench. In 1890, while an elective State Judge, he upheld the judgment of a lower court, which had awarded damages against the Bricklayers' Union for boycotting a firm with which it had no quarrel, because the said firm had sold goods to an employer with whom there was a dispute. Judge Taft said that this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"secondary" boycott, as it is called, was an unlawful conspiracy, the participants in which were liable for any injury arising therefrom. Subsequently, in 1894, when he was on the Federal Bench, he laid down the law in the case of Phelan (a lieutenant of E. V. Debs of the American Railway Union), punished for contempt of court, in calling out employees of an unoffending road which was being conducted by a United States Court's receiver. Phelan's and Debs's purpose, he said, was to starve the companies and the public into compelling Pullman to do something which they had no lawful right to compel him to do. Judge Taft declared that the starvation of a nation cannot be a lawful purpose of combinations, and that it is utterly immaterial whether the purpose be effected by means usually lawful or otherwise. It is doubtful whether this decision can materially injure Mr. Taft in the eyes of fair-minded Labor-Unionists, in view of the fact that later the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Firemen, in their strike against the Wabash Railroad, invoked his ruling in the Phelan case to get an injunction against them dissolved, and they succeeded. The second objection to Mr. Taft's availability is based on the assertion that the opposition of the negro voters growing out of the Brownsville incident may cause him to lose some doubtful States. Such a result seems improbable, because negro voters would have nothing to gain from a Democratic administration, and because the platform adopted at Chicago declares without reservation for the enforcement in letter and spirit of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution. There is absolutely no ground for the third objection, namely, that, on his return from the Philippines, by way of the Trans-Siberian Railway, he made a courteous reply to the Tsar's hospitable greeting. Our Jewish citizens have too much good sense to imagine that it was the function of Mr. Taft to lecture a European sovereign on his methods of ruling his dominions. International business is not transacted in that way. Even more derisible is the objection based on the supposed stupidity of Grand Army men, who are credited with an intention to use their influence against Mr. Taft because, in an earnest eulogy of General Grant, he had repeated the statement of a certain writer to the effect that, some years before the Civil War, that officer had resigned for the reason that he was then addicted to the drinking habit. Every intelli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gent person can see that the purpose of the allusion was to emphasize the splendor of Grant's conquest of the Southern Confederacy by recalling that he had first been forced to effect a conquest of himself. That, according to Scripture, was the greater victory. As for the fifth objection, that Mr. Taft is "another man's man," the mere legatee of President Roosevelt, and the obsequious executor of another man's policies—that is one of those silly notions that inspection of Mr. Taft's past record and observation of his personal attitude in the campaign now begun are likely quickly to dispel.

Turning to the Republican platform, we pass over the plank relating to negroes, which we have already mentioned, and also the perfunctory glorification of the past and recent achievements of the Republican party, together with the fulsome eulogy of Mr. Roosevelt's Presidential career. The enactment of the Emergency Currency Bill is commended. To an immediate revision of the existing tariff, at a special session of Congress to follow the inauguration of the next President, the Republican party is definitely committed. The principle of protection to be embodied in the revised tariff is, we are told, the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and that of production abroad—to which is to be added a reasonable profit for American industry. Of course, Stand-Patters and the original revisionists are likely to differ materially as to the meaning of the word "reasonable." It will be observed that the platform does not accept the Taft programme for the Philippines, because, while, in general terms, it advocates a free interchange of products between the United States and the archipelago, it expressly excepts sugar and tobacco, as to which such limitations must be made as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests. How much satisfaction such a qualified concession will give the Filipinos remains to be seen. Among the concessions made to the Labor-Unionists are those planks of the platform which favor the establishment of a postal savings-bank system; the strengthening of the Sherman Anti-Trust law; such an increase of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission as will enable it to approve of traffic agreements between railroads, while sturdily maintaining the principle of competition between lines naturally competing. The same plank also advocates such national legislation and supervision as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will prevent a future over-issue of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers. The plank relating to Court injunctions, which was finally agreed upon, after long and heated discussion in the Committee on Resolutions, is virtually a defeat for the Labor-Unionists, and for the Roosevelt-Taft wing of the Republican party. As finally framed and adopted, it simply recommends that no injunction should hereafter be issued without notice, except where irreparable injury would result from delay, in which case a speedy hearing should be granted to the enjoined party on an order to show cause. This simply amounts to a recommendation that Congress should define by statute one of the powers which already is exercised in the way proposed by Federal Courts of Equity.

Such are the chief controversial planks in the Republican platform. It is obvious that the programme, taken as a whole, is more likely to please the conservative than the radical element of the party. At the same time, the general endorsement of Mr. Roosevelt's policies, supplemented as it was on the evening of June 18th by an immediate public expression of approval by the President, will doubtless suffice to prevent even such Radicals as Senator La Follette from wavering in their allegiance to the party. Under the circumstances, have Democrats any chance of success in the coming election? It is the consensus of expert and disinterested observers in Washington that Democrats have no chance whatever of victory, provided they put forward for their standard-bearer Mr. Bryan, who is himself committed to the support of Mr. Roosevelt's policies, and who, so far as he is associated with any independent programme, has alienated many of his friends by his advocacy of the Government ownership of railroads and of the application of the Swiss Initiative and Referendum to the United States. It by no means follows, however, that the Democrats might not have a chance of triumph, if, instead of Mr. Bryan, they should nominate Governor John A. Johnson of Minnesota or Judge George Gray of Delaware, or almost any of the alternative candidates, whose claims have lately been described at length in this REVIEW. On the whole, however, there is but little likelihood that the Democratic Convention, to be held at Denver, will pursue a judicious course, in view of the assertion that Mr. Bryan has already at his disposal some two-thirds of the elected delegates.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

The Undertaker at Close Range.

WE have received the following interesting and illuminating communication from Brookville, Indiana:

"SIR,—Being closely associated at the present time with two undertakers, my husband and my brother-in-law, and by actual count numbering among my acquaintances no less than a dozen others, I cannot refrain from making some reply to your article entitled 'The Proper Conduct of Funerals.' We cannot, it is true, deny the gravity of death, and if, as you say, 'dying is one of the most popular things we can do,' do you not even then diminish our last rays of glory on earth by the glaring publicity of the undertaker? To our mind the dead, the friends, the funeral, the—everything must be completely overshadowed by that monstrosity in human shape and garb—the undertaker.

"But to enlighten the unenlightened. 'How would it seem to be an undertaker?' Not one bit different than to be any other man in the every-day walks of life — a man, just as other men, ofttimes doing without compensation the duty which lies nearest him. Unwittingly, perhaps, the remarks are most unjust to a respected and respectable profession. The man of whom you speak is not 'notoriously considerate' and 'ostentatiously patient' with those with whom he has to deal. He is in all cases both considerate and patient, not on account of 'business,' but because of the manhood in him. Sometimes, however, he may be so human as to find that patience has ceased to be a virtue.

"'Physically he conveys the impression of unhealthiness.' Verily your knowledge must be very limited. In my circle of acquaintances the majority give evidence of as healthy internal organs as one could wish for. I believe the practice of the profession does sometimes seriously affect the health. I know personally of three such cases, but to give as a cause 'the constant mournful mien' can only awaken a feeling of indignation in those who realize the falsity of the statement. When you consider that in all probability poisonous gases arise from all dead bodies; the various diseases with which he must come in contact; that he must go to all sorts and conditions of men; that he must be willing to handle bodies in conditions which most people would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never dream of, and a hundred other things which only an undertaker of experience could tell you of—it is a matter far too serious to be treated lightly.

"Judging from the members of my own family, undertakers quite frequently enjoy a game of tennis, as well as such sports as hunting, fishing, etc., and more than once have I seen them at the country club, a dance or the theatre, the gayest of the gay, and yet retaining the 'custom of the élite.'

"Notwithstanding the fact that my husband's eyelids do sometimes droop in church (how like most men that is), I feel sure that his comprehension is in no way blunted, but rather awakened to the desirability of saving his soul. He is a member of the official Board of the Methodist Church in this city and attends church regularly.

"Of the men in this profession of whom I speak nearly all are allied with some church, and the greater number of them are active church-workers.

"No, he does not throughout meals or at any other time 'preserve his official demeanor.' He enjoys home and the baby. Yes, he even has children; sometimes as many as six and sometimes, not being blessed with one of his own, he adopts one.

"That they 'unconsciously come to regard themselves as apart from other men—and so perhaps they are, as a sexton is or a hangman'—is most unjust to men engaged in a harmless and necessary business. Both my husband and myself are alumni of one of the leading universities of the Middle West. He was formerly employed in a bank, and in becoming an undertaker neither he nor his family were ostracized from the society to which they had been born and raised, neither at home nor abroad. We still retain the standing which is by birth, manners and education ours.

"As to why 'anybody could be induced to make a business or profession of the handling of corpses' there may be various reasons. I believe the majority of undertakers are influenced by circumstance rather than choice. In two instances within my knowledge has the business descended from father to son. In one instance the profession was selected from choice—by a man as far from the one portrayed in your article as the North is from the South.

"As to the little book entitled 'The Funeral,' when you more thoroughly understand the subject you may realize whose criticism it is that suggests 'flippancy hardly becoming the treatment of a subject so shrouded in solemnity.'

"I am, sir, etc.,

"HALLIE HARRELL SHOWALTER."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LA SENTENCOJ DE SALOMONO.*

(El la Biblio.)

EL LA ORIGINALO TRADUKIS, L. L. ZAMENHOF.

ĈAPITRO XVII.

(1) Pli bona estas seka peco da pano, sed kun trankvileco, ol domo plena de viando kun malpaco. (2) Saĝa sklavo regos super filo hontinda kaj dividos heredon kune kun fratoj. (3) Fandujo estas por arĝento kaj forno por oro, sed la korojn esploras Dio. (4) Malbon faranto obeas malbonajn buŝojn, malveremulo atentas malpian langon. (5) Kiu mokas malriĉulon, tiu ofendas lian Kreinton; kiu ĝojas pri ies malfeliĉo, tiu ne restos sen puno. (6) Nepoj estas krono de maljunuloj, kaj gloro de infanoj estas iliaj gepatroj. (7) Al malsaĝulo ne konvenas alta parolado, kaj ankoraŭ malpli al eminentulo mensogado. (8) Donaco estas juvelo en la okuloj de ĝiamastro; kien ajn li sin turnos, li sukcesos. (9) Kiu kovras kulpon, tiu serĉas amikecon; sed kiu reparolas pri la afero, tiu forigas amikon. (10) Pli efikas riproĉo ĉe saĝulo, ol cent batoj ĉe malsaĝulo. (11) Malbonulo serĉas nur ribelon; sed terura sendato estos sendita kontraŭ li. (12) Pli bone estas renkonti ursinon, al kiu estas rabitaj ĝiaj infanoj, ol malsaĝulon kun lia malsaĝeco. (13) Kiu redonas malbonon por bono, el ties domo ne malaperos malbono. (14) La komenco de malpaco estas kiel liberigo de akvo; antaŭ ol vi tro entiriĝis, forlasu la malpacon. (15) Kiu pravigas malvirtulon kaj kiu malpravigas

* Dr. Zamenhof has made this translation of Proverbs from the original text especially for The North American Review. The first chapter appeared in the December, 1907, issue. The subsequent chapters will be published during 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

virtulon, ambaŭ estas abomenaĵo por Dio. (16) Por kio servas mono en la mano de malsaĝulo? ĉu por aĉeti saĝon, kiam li koron ne havas? (17) En ĉiu tempo amiko amas, kaj li fariĝas frato en mizero. (18) Homo malsaĝa donas manon en manon kaj garantias por sia proksimulo. (19) Kiu amas malpacon, tiu amas pekon; kiu tro alte levas sian pordon, tiu serĉas pereon. (20) Malica koro ne trovos bonon, kaj kiu havas neĝustan langon, tiu enfalos en malfeliĉon. (21) Kiu naskas malsaĝulon, havas ĉagrenon, kaj patro de malprudentulo ne havos ĝojon. (22) Ĝoja koro estas saniga, kaj malĝoja spirito sekigas la ostojn. (23) Kaŝitajn donacojn akceptas malvirtulo, por deklini la vojon de la justeco. (24) Antaŭ la vizaĝo de prudentulo estas saĝo, sed la okuloj de malsaĝulo estas en la fino de la tero. (25) Filo malsaĝa estas ĉagreno por sia patro kaj malĝojo por sia patrino. (26) Ne estas bone suferigi virtulon, nek bati noblulon, kiu agas juste. (27) Kiu ŝparas siajn vortojn, tiu estas prudenta, kaj trankvilanimulo estas homo saĝa. (28) Eĉ malsaĝulo, se li silentas, estas rigardata kiel saĝulo, kaj kiel prudentulo—se li tenas fermita sian buŝon.

ĈAPITRO XVIII.

(1) Kiu apartiĝas, tiu serĉas sian volupton kaj iras kontraŭ ĉiu saĝa konsilo. (2) Malsaĝulo ne deziras prudenton, sed nur malkovri sian koron. (3) Kiam venas malvirtulo, venas ankaŭ malestimo kun honto kaj moko. (4) La vortoj de homa buŝo estas profunda akvo, la fonto de saĝo estas fluanta rivero. (5) Ne estas bone favori malvirtulon, por faligi virtulon ĉe la juĝo. (6) La lipoj de malsaĝulo kondukas al malpaco, kaj lia buŝo venigas batojn. (7) La buŝo de malsaĝulo estas pereo por li, kaj liaj lipoj en retigas lian animon. (8) La vortoj de kalumniantoj estas kiel sorĉo, kaj ili penetras en la profundon de la ventro. (9) Kiu estas senzorga en sia laborado, tiu estas frato de pereiganto. (10) La nomo de Dio estas fortika turo: tien kuras virtulo kaj estas ŝirmata. (11) La havo de riĉulo estas lia fortika urbo, kaj kiel post alta muro li estas en sia bela ĉambro. (12) Antaŭ la pereo la koro de homo fieriĝas, kaj antaŭ honoro estas humileco. (13) Kiu respondas antaŭ ol li aŭdis, tiu havas malsaĝon kaj honton. (14) La spirito de homo nutras lin en lia malsano, sed spiriton premitan kiu povas elporti? (15) La koro de saĝulo akiras prudenton, kaj la orelo de saĝuloj

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

serĉas scion. (16) Donaco de homo donas al li vastecon kaj kondukas lin al la grandsinjoroj. (17) La unua estas prava en sia proceso, sed venas lia proksimulo kaj ĝin klarigas. (18) La loto ĉesigas disputojn kaj decidas inter potenculoj. (19) Malpaciĝinta frato estas pli obstina, ol fortikigita urbo, kaj disputoj estas kiel rigliloj de turo. (20) De la fruktoj de la buŝo de homo satiĝas lia ventro; li manĝas la produktojn̂ de siaj lipoj. (21) Morto kaj vivo dependas de la lango, kaj kiu ĝin amas, tiu manĝos ĝiajn fruktojn. (22) Kiu trovis edzinon, tiu trovis bonon kaj ricevis favoron de Dio. (23) Per petegado parolas malriĉulo, kaj riĉulo respondas arogante. (24) Havi multajn amikojn estas embarase; sed ofte amiko estas pli sindona ol frato.

ĈAPITRO XIX.

(1) Pli bona estas malriĉulo, kiu iras en sia senkulpeco, ol malicbuŝulo kaj malsaĝulo. (2) Animo sen prudento ne estas bona, kaj kiu tro rapidas, tiu pekas. (3) Malsaĝeco de homo erarigas lian vojon, kaj lia koro koleras Dion. (4) Riĉeco donas multon da amikoj, sed malriĉulo estas forlasata de sia amiko. (5) Falsa atestanto ne restos sen puno, kaj kiu parolas mensogojn, tiu ne saviĝos. (6) Multaj serĉas favoron de eminentulo, kaj ĉiu estas amiko de homo, kiu donas donacojn. (7) Ĉiuj fratoj de malriĉulo lin malamas, tiom pli malproksimiĝas de li liaj amikoj; li havas esperon pri vortoj, kiuj ne estos plenumitaj. (8) Kiu akiras saĝon, tiu amas sian animon, kiu gardas prudenton, tiu trovas bonon. (9) Falsa atestanto ne restos sen puno, kaj kiu parolas mengsogojn, tiu pereos. (10) Al malsaĝulo ne konvenas agrablaĵo, ankoraŭ malpli konvenas al sklavo regi super princoj. (11) Saĝo de homo faras lin pacienca, kaj gloro por li estas pardoni pekon. (12) Kiel krio de leono estas la kolero de reĝo, kaj lia favoro estas kiel roso sur herbo. (13) Pereo por sia patro estas malsaĝa filo, kaj malpacema virino estas kiel konstanta gutado. (14) Domo kaj havo estas heredataj de gepatroj, sed saĝa edzino estas de Dio. (15) Mallaboremeco enigas en profundan dormon, kaj animo maldiligenta suferos malsaton. (16) Kiu konservas moralordonon, konservas sian animon, sed kiu ne atentas sian vojon, tiu mortos. (17) Kiu kompatas malriĉulon, tiu pruntedonas al Dio, kaj Tiu redonos al li por lia bonfaro. (18) Punu vian filon, dum ekzistas espero, kaj lian ploradon ne atentu. (19) Forte kolera devas esti punata,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ĉar se vi ĝin indulgos, ĝi fariĝos ankoraŭ pli granda. (20) Aŭskultu konsilon kaj akceptu admonon, por ke vi poste estu saĝa. (21) Multaj estas la intencoj en la koro de homo, sed la decido de Dio restas fortike. (22) Ĝojo estas por la homo lia bonfaro; kaj pli bona estas malriĉulo ol homo mensogema. (23) Timo antaŭ Dio kondukas al vico, al sateco kaj al evito de malbono. (24) Mallaboremulo metas sian manon en la poton kaj eĉ al sia buŝo li ĝin ne relevas. (25) Se vi batos blasfemanton, sensciulo fariĝos atenta; se oni punas saĝulon, li komprenas la instruon. (26) Kiu ruinigas patron kaj forpelas patrinon, estas filo hontinda kaj malbeninda. (27) Ĉesu, mia filo, aŭskulti admonon kaj tamen dekliniĝi de la vortoj de la instruo. (28) Fripona atestanto mokas juĝon, kaj la buŝo de malvirtuloj en glutas maljustaĵon. (29) La blasfemantojn atendas punoj, kaj batoj la dorson de malsaĝuloj.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

HENRY LOOMIS NELSON,

whose lamented death a few months ago involved, it was widely felt, a severe loss to the country, was David A. Wells Professor of Political Science in Williams College, where he had received his education. He was admitted to the bar in 1869. In 1878 he went to Washington as correspondent of the "Boston Post," and after serving that paper in that capacity for seven years, he became its editor-in-chief. From 1894 to 1898 he edited "Harper's Weekly." He was the author of a number of well-known books, including "Our Unjust Tariff Law" and "The Money we Need."

JEAN JAURÈS,

one of the most conspicuous figures in French public life, has been a member of the Chamber of Deputies since 1885. He was born at Castres in 1859, and for some time taught Philosophy at Albi and Toulouse. He edits a paper entitled "*La Petite République.*" He is the leader of the Socialist party in France, and the author of a number of works, among which may be mentioned "*Action Socialiste*" and "*Études Socialistes.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sir Martin Conway

was educated at Repton and Trinity College, Cambridge. From 1882 to 1885, he was University Extension lecturer. From 1885 to 1888, he was Professor of Art in the University College, Liverpool; and, from 1888 to 1890, he was Honorary Secretary of the Art Congress. In 1889, he travelled in Egypt and the East. He has gained great fame as a mountain-climber. In 1892, he climbed a peak in the Himalayas twenty-three thousand feet high. In 1894, he traversed the Alps from end to end. He has explored the interior of Spitzbergen, the Bolivian Andes and the glaciers of Tierra del Fuego. He has published a large number of books.

Theodore Gilman,

a well-known banker of New York, graduated from Williams College in 1862. He has been chairman, president, treasurer, director and trustee of various railway and other business and financial corporations. He has written a number of works on financial subjects, including "A Graded Banking System" and "Federal Clearing House." He prepared and presented bills to the Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth and Fifty-seventh Congresses providing for the incorporation of clearing houses, and made statements in their support before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Elizabeth Bisland

(Mrs. Wetmore) is a Southerner by birth, and her earliest literary work was done for the New Orleans "Times Democrat." For some time she was on the editorial staff of the "Cosmopolitan Magazine," and she has contributed frequently to the Review. She is the author of "A Flying Trip around the World," "A Candle of Understanding" and a Life of Lafcadio Hearn.

Britannicus

is a well-known English writer, who for many years has made a close and comprehensive study of international pol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itics, and of the questions which arise out of, or affect, the relations between the great European Powers.

GEORGE V. L. MEYER,

Postmaster-General of the United States, after graduating from Harvard, in 1879, took an active interest in public affairs in his native State of Massachusetts. He was a member of the Boston Common Council in 1889-90; a member of the Board of Aldermen in 1891; a member of the Massachusetts Legislature from 1892 to 1896, and Speaker of the House from 1894 to 1896. In 1905 he was appointed United States Ambassador to Russia.

SYDNEY BROOKS

is an English journalist who has already contributed a number of articles to the REVIEW on a variety of subjects. He visited Ireland last year, and spent a number of months in observing on the spot existing conditions in that country.

FRANCIS M. BURDICK,

Dwight Professor of Law in Columbia University, is a graduate of Hamilton College. He practised law in Utica from 1872 to 1883. He was Professor of Law and History in Hamilton College from 1882 to 1887, and Professor of Law in Cornell University from 1887 to 1891. He is the author of a number of standard works on legal subjects, including "The Essentials of Business Law," "Cases on Torts," "Law of Partnership" and "Cases on Partnership."

OTTO SIMON

is a German educator who has for years been an enthusiastic student of Esperanto, and who has watched with sympathetic interest the progress made by the new auxiliary language in his native country.

JESSIE B. RITTENHOUSE,

author and critic, graduated from Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, New York, in 1890, and for several years thereafter taught Latin and English in Cairo, Illinois, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grand Haven, Michigan. She began her literary career in 1895 as contributor to newspapers and press syndicates.

EDWARD PORRITT

is a native of Bury, in Lancashire, England. For several years he was connected with a number of English papers. In 1884, he came to the United States and joined the staff of the "St. Louis Globe-Democrat." Returning to England, he was employed for some time as a parliamentary reporter. He now resides in the United States as correspondent for important British newspapers. He is the author of "The Englishman at Home" and "The History of the Unreformed House of Commons."

BRANDER MATTHEWS

is one of the best known of living American authors. He was born in New Orleans in 1852, and studied at Columbia College, where he graduated in 1871. He was admitted to the New York bar, but he turned from law to literature, to which, for many years, he has devoted an indefatigable and versatile pen. In 1892, he was appointed Professor of Dramatic Literature in Columbia University.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED